

BDK ENGLISH TRIPITAKA

**THREE TEXTS ON
CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY**



BDK English Tripiṭaka 60-I, II, III

**THREE TEXTS ON
CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY**

Demonstration of Consciousness Only

by Hsüan-tsang

The Thirty Verses on Consciousness Only

by Vasubandhu

**The Treatise in Twenty Verses
on Consciousness Only**

by Vasubandhu

Translated from the Chinese of Hsüan-tsang

(Taishō Volume 31, Numbers 1585, 1586, 1590)

by

Francis H. Cook

**Numata Center
for Buddhist Translation and Research
1999**

© 1999 by Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai and Numata Center for
Buddhist Translation Research

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored
in a retrieval system, or transcribed in any form or by any means
—electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise—
without the prior written permission of the publisher.

First Printing, 1999
ISBN: 1-886439-04-4
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 95-079041

Published by
Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research
2620 Warring Street
Berkeley, California 94704

Printed in the United States of America

A Message on the Publication of the English Tripiṭaka

The Buddhist canon is said to contain eighty-four thousand different teachings. I believe that this is because the Buddha's basic approach was to prescribe a different treatment for every spiritual ailment, much as a doctor prescribes a different medicine for every medical ailment. Thus his teachings were always appropriate for the particular suffering individual and for the time at which the teaching was given, and over the ages not one of his prescriptions has failed to relieve the suffering to which it was addressed.

Ever since the Buddha's Great Demise over twenty-five hundred years ago, his message of wisdom and compassion has spread throughout the world. Yet no one has ever attempted to translate the entire Buddhist canon into English throughout the history of Japan. It is my greatest wish to see this done and to make the translations available to the many English-speaking people who have never had the opportunity to learn about the Buddha's teachings.

Of course, it would be impossible to translate all of the Buddha's eighty-four thousand teachings in a few years. I have, therefore, had one hundred thirty-nine of the scriptural texts in the prodigious Taishō edition of the Chinese Buddhist canon selected for inclusion in the First Series of this translation project.

It is in the nature of this undertaking that the results are bound to be criticized. Nonetheless, I am convinced that unless someone takes it upon himself or herself to initiate this project, it will never be done. At the same time, I hope that an improved, revised edition will appear in the future.

It is most gratifying that, thanks to the efforts of more than a hundred Buddhist scholars from the East and the West, this monumental project has finally gotten off the ground. May the rays of the Wisdom of the Compassionate One reach each and every person in the world.

NUMATA Yehan
Founder of the English
Tripiṭaka Project

August 7, 1991

Editorial Foreword

In January, 1982, Dr. NUMATA Yehan, the founder of the Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai (Society for the Promotion of Buddhism), decided to begin the monumental task of translating the complete Taishō edition of the Chinese Tripiṭaka (Buddhist Canon) into the English language. Under his leadership, a special preparatory committee was organized in April, 1982. By July of the same year, the Translation Committee of the English Tripiṭaka was officially convened.

The initial Committee consisted of the following members: HANAYAMA Shōyū (Chairperson); BANDŌ Shōjun; ISHIGAMI Zennō; KAMATA Shigeo; KANAOKA Shūyū; MAYEDA Sengaku; NARA Yasuaki; SAYEKI Shinkō; (late) SHIOIRI Ryōtatsu; TAMARU Noriyoshi; (late) TAMURA Kwansei; URYŪZU Ryūshin; and YUYAMA Akira. Assistant members of the Committee were as follows: KANAZAWA Atsushi; WATANABE Shōgo; Rolf Giebel of New Zealand; and Rudy Smet of Belgium.

After holding planning meetings on a monthly basis, the Committee selected one hundred thirty-nine texts for the First Series of translations, an estimated one hundred printed volumes in all. The texts selected are not necessarily limited to those originally written in India but also include works written or composed in China and Japan. While the publication of the First Series proceeds, the texts for the Second Series will be selected from among the remaining works; this process will continue until all the texts, in Japanese as well as in Chinese, have been published.

Frankly speaking, it will take perhaps one hundred years or more to accomplish the English translation of the complete Chinese and Japanese texts, for they consist of thousands of works. Nevertheless, as Dr. NUMATA wished, it is the sincere hope of the Committee that this project will continue unto completion, even after all its present members have passed away.

It must be mentioned here that the final object of this project is not academic fulfillment but the transmission of the teaching of the

Buddha to the whole world in order to create harmony and peace among mankind. To that end, the translators have been asked to minimize the use of explanatory notes of the kind which are indispensable in academic texts so that the attention of general readers will not be unduly distracted from the primary text. Also, a glossary of selected terms is appended to aid in understanding the text.

To my great regret, however, Dr. NUMATA passed away on May 5, 1994, at the age of 97, entrusting his son, Mr. NUMATA Toshihide, with the continuation and completion of the Translation Project. The Committee also lost its able and devoted Chairperson, Professor HANAYAMA Shōyū, on June 16, 1995, at the age of 63. After these severe blows, the Committee elected me, Vice-President of the Musashino Women's College, to be the Chair in October 1995. The Committee has renewed its determination to carry out the noble intention of Dr. NUMATA, under the leadership of Mr. NUMATA Toshihide.

The present members of the Committee are MAYEDA Sengaku (Chairperson), BANDŌ Shōjun, ISHIGAMI Zennō, ICHISHIMA Shōshin, KAMATA Shigeo, KANAOKA Shūyū, NARA Yasuaki, SAYEKI Shinkō, TAMARU Noriyoshi, URYŪZU Ryūshin, and YUYAMA Akira. Assistant members are WATANABE Shōgo and UEDA Noboru.

The Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research was established in November 1984, in Berkeley, California, U.S.A., to assist in the publication of the BDK English Tripiṭaka First Series. In December 1991, the Publication Committee was organized at the Numata Center, with Professor Philip Yampolsky as the Chairperson. To our sorrow, Professor Yampolsky passed away in July 1996, but thankfully Dr. Kenneth Inada is continuing the work as Chairperson. This text is the sixteenth volume to be published and distributed by the Numata Center. All of the remaining texts will be published under the supervision of this Committee, in close cooperation with the Translation Committee in Tokyo.

MAYEDA Sengaku
Chairperson
Translation Committee of
the BDK English Tripiṭaka

July 10, 1999

Publisher's Foreword

The Publication Committee works in close cooperation with the Editorial Committee of the BDK English Tripiṭaka in Tokyo, Japan. Since December 1991, it has operated from the Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research in Berkeley, California. Its principal mission is to oversee and facilitate the publication in English of selected texts from the one hundred-volume Taishō Edition of the Chinese Tripiṭaka, along with a few major influential Japanese Buddhist texts not in the Tripiṭaka. The list of selected texts is conveniently appended at the end of each volume. In the text itself, the Taishō Edition page and column designations are provided in the margins.

The Committee is committed to the task of publishing clear, readable English texts. It honors the deep faith, spirit, and concern of the late Reverend Doctor NUMATA Yehan to disseminate Buddhist teachings throughout the world.

In July 1996, the Committee unfortunately lost its valued Chairperson, Dr. Philip Yampolsky, who was a stalwart leader, trusted friend, and esteemed colleague. We follow in his shadow. In February 1997, I was appointed to guide the Committee in his place.

The Committee is charged with the normal duties of a publishing firm—general editing, formatting, copyediting, proofreading, indexing, and checking linguistic fidelity. The Committee members are Diane Ames, Eisho Nasu, Charles Niimi, Koh Nishiike, and the president and director of the Numata Center, Reverend Kiyoshi S. Yamashita.

Kenneth K. Inada
Chairperson
Publication Committee

July 10, 1999

Contents

A Message on the Publication of the English Tripiṭaka

NUMATA Yehan v

Editorial Foreword *MAYEDA Sengaku* vii

Publisher's Foreword *Kenneth K. Inada* ix

Demonstration of Consciousness Only

Hsüan-tsang 1-372

The Thirty Verses on Consciousness Only

Vasubandhu 373-384

The Treatise in Twenty Verses on Consciousness Only

Vasubandhu 387-408

Glossary 409

Selected Bibliography 423

Index 425

A List of the Volumes of the BDK English Tripiṭaka (First Series)

**DEMONSTRATION OF
CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY**

by
Hsüan-tsang

Translated from the Chinese
(Taishō Volume 31, Number 1585)

by
Francis H. Cook

Translator's Introduction

The name of the text that I have translated as "Demonstration of Consciousness Only" is *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, number 1585 in the Japanese *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* edition of the Buddhist canon. Its author was the Chinese monk-scholar Hsüan-tsang (600–64), who also translated about seventy-five Sanskrit Buddhist texts.

It is said that Hsüan-tsang decided to travel to India in search of answers to questions he could not find in the Buddhist texts available to him in China and to find more important texts to bring back. He set out for India in 629, arriving at the great Buddhist university of Nālandā in India in 633, after a long and hazardous land voyage through the deserts of Central Asia and the icy mountains of north-west India.

During the five years he spent at Nālandā, he discovered the verse treatise *Triṃśikā-vijñaptimātratā* by the famous monk-scholar Vasubandhu, along with ten prose commentaries on these "Thirty Verses" by Dharmapala, Sthiramati, Nanda, Citrabhānu, Guṇamati, Jinamitra, Jñānacandra, Bandhuśrī, Śuddhacandra, and Jinaputra. The "Thirty Verses" and the ten commentaries became the basis for Hsüan-tsang's *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*. He returned to China in 645 and set about to translate this and a number of other texts he had brought with him.

The *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* is presented simply as a translation of Vasubandhu's "Verses" and the commentaries, but in fact Hsüan-tsang was selective in his use of the commentaries; he seems to have decided that Dharmapāla's interpretation of the "Verses" was the correct one. Consequently, of the ten commentaries, only three are consistently

used, with a fourth occasionally appearing. When Hsüan-tsang presents the interpretations, he usually gives those of Sthiramati, Nanda, and Dharmapāla, occasionally including that of Citrabhānu. The interpretation given last, that of Dharmapāla, is invariably considered the correct one. Consequently, for all practical purposes, the text consists of the translation of the "Thirty Verses," generally referred to as the Treatise, plus the interpretation of Dharmapāla as the correct view, with the supplementation of two or three divergent interpretations. There is some question among Buddhist scholars whether Dharmapāla's interpretation of the doctrine of consciousness only was what Vasubandhu intended in his "Verses."

Hsüan-tsang's disciple K'uei-chi created an independent school based on the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*, known in China as the Fa-hsiang School (School of the Characteristics of Dharmas) and as Wei-shih, "Consciousness Only." This school was one of the earliest to be introduced to Japan, where it is known as the Hossō (Fa-hsiang) School. The text and the school have had very important places in the development of East Asian Buddhism, and the text is still the object of considerable interest and study.

In my translation, I have indicated the "Thirty Verses" by upper-case print, both when the verses are introduced and subsequently when each term is defined and discussed by the commentaries.

Vasubandhu's "Verses" and the prose commentaries may be seen as an attempt to clarify the question of how ignorance (*avidyā*) or delusion (*moha*) take place and how they are removed, since this is the Buddhist task par excellence. The question may be restated as that of how deluded, erroneous perception and knowledge can be replaced with enlightened, unerring perception and knowledge.

While all Buddhists agreed that the fundamental obstacle to the life of liberation and compassion was ignorance of the real nature of events, there is a need to show systematically, rigorously, and in detail what the mechanism of ignorance is, as well as the process of liberation.

Hsüan-tsang's text is an attempt to answer the question of the mechanism and nature of ignorance by demonstrating that seemingly

real external objects of perception (*dharma*) and the equally seemingly real self (*ātman*) who perceives these things are mental fabrications that do not exist apart from consciousness itself. Consequently, there are no real external objects to crave, fear, dominate, be subject to, or otherwise be obsessed with. By the same token, there is no real, unchanging inner self that craves, fears, and so on. Both the grasper or knowing self (*grāhaka*) and the grasped (*grāhya*) are mere mental constructs.

To believe that there is a self and really existing external things that are meaningful to the self is delusion and results in suffering, confusion, and the incapacity for benevolence and compassion. To realize that the self and apparently real things are only mental images results in the ability to endure suffering patiently, with clarity, and the Buddhist life of compassion. Thus liberation and Buddhahood result from the realization that selves and real external things are nothing but ideas (*viññapti-mātra*) or, as Hsüan-tsang expresses it, consciousness only (*wei-shih*).

The theory of the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* is that basic or fundamental consciousness (*mūla-viññāna*) comes to appear naturally and spontaneously in the form of a seeing part (*darśana-bhāga*) and a seen part (*nimitta-bhāga*). The seeming reality of an inner self perceiving external events is nothing more than one aspect of consciousness perceiving itself in the form of images. A third part of consciousness, the *manas*, or thinking aspect, interprets the two parts as a self and an external world. This situation is also the basis for hatred, craving, fear, and other passions. In fact, the apparently real external world of things is nothing but internal images perceived by consciousness and grasped as a source of attachment by thought.

The question of the origin of these images is answered by the theory of "seeds" (*bija*). The term "seed" is a metaphor for a potentiality that can become one of the images of consciousness, in the same way that a real seed is the potential for the later mature plant. Some of these seed-potentials are innate, while others are acquired through experience. They can be potentials for impurity and unwholeness or for purity and wholeness. They are all harbored in

root consciousness which, in its capacity of storing them, is referred to as “store consciousness” (*ālaya-vijñāna*). The process of becoming enlightened and a Buddha is portrayed as a purification process whereby the seeds of impurity and unwholesomeness are destroyed and the seeds of purity and wholesomeness are increased. This process is known as the “transmutation of the support” (*āśraya-parāvṛtti*), referring to the total, drastic change in the nature of the root consciousness, the support of both kinds of seeds.

In the course of describing this transmutation, whereby one changes from an ordinary, deluded being into a Buddha, the *Ch’eng wei-shih lun* undertakes a long, detailed explanation of the nature and functions of eight kinds of consciousness, with particular emphasis on the eighth consciousness as storer of seeds. This discussion also involves a detailed description of the nature and functions of mental activities (*caitta*), such as craving, faith, sloth, *samādhi*, etc., divided into categories of good, bad, neither good nor bad, and so on. This cataloging, definition, and analysis of each mental activity makes the text an excellent source for exact knowledge of Buddhist technical terminology. There is also an important discussion of the “three natures” (*trisvabhāva*), important for the way it clarifies the nature of Buddhist enlightenment as the revelation of the ultimate truth (*paramārtha-satya*), true suchness (*tathatā*), and the perfected nature (*pariniṣpanna-svabhāva*) of things through the eternal separation of imagination from those things that occur simply through co-conditioning, referring, of course, to the mental images.

Final sections of the text are devoted to a lengthy and detailed description of the bodhisattva’s traversing of the stages, states, and related accomplishments from the very beginning of the process to the culminating state of Buddhahood. In the course of this description, there are discussions of such matters as the ten obstacles to be eliminated, the ten kinds of true suchness to be realized, and other related subjects, making the text a rich source of knowledge of Mahayana doctrine and practice.

Although I have translated almost all technical terms in the following pages, I have left a few untranslated, either because the

original Sanskrit term always appears in Western works untranslated, such as Buddha, *nirvāṇa*, and bodhisattva, or because I can find no exact translation term that is acceptable in all ways. Also, sometimes the term is untranslated (while being translated elsewhere here) because Hsüan-tsang specifies the original Sanskrit term by simply transliterating it rather than translating it (as with *ma-na* for *manas*, elsewhere translated as "thought"). The following terms are usually untranslated:

1. *dharma*. Uncapitalized, it names an experiential datum. It might be translated as "object" or "thing," except that these words refer to such things as people, animals, plants, human artifacts, and the like. These are not dharmas. The Fa-hsiang School has a formal list of one hundred dharmas that constitute what it considers to be real experiential data. The list includes matter (*rūpa*) such as eyes, ears, noses, etc., with their corresponding objects, such as shapes with color, sounds, odors, etc. Also included is a long list of psychic factors included under mind and mental activities, such as attention, craving, faith, agitation, etc.

2. *Dharma*, spelled with a capital D, is the Buddhist term for what we would call "Buddhism." The Dharma is the teaching of the Buddha, the laws that characterize existence, the truth.

3. *saṃsāra*. The opposite of *nirvāṇa*. The world of suffering, death, and rebirth. I have also translated it as "birth and death."

4. *karma*. Also translated in the following pages as "action," which is the literal meaning. It refers always to action that is morally good or bad or neutral. The results of *karma* are *karma-phala*, "fruits of action."

5. *dhāraṇī*. Usually refers to an incantation or spell. In this text, it seems to simply mean a "support" or "bearer," meaning a support for enlightened knowing and related wholesome mental states. From the Sanskrit root *dhṛ*, meaning "to support."

6. *śamādhi*. Translated in some English works as "meditation." However, there can be meditation without *śamādhi*. The term is defined as "one-pointedness of mind" and refers to a focussing of attention on a single object to the exclusion of all other external stimuli.

It also refers to the oneness of subject and object in which the subject-object mode of cognition is overcome.

7. *manas*. Also translated as “thought” in the text. It is the name of the seventh consciousness among the eight recognized by this text.

There are two other translations of the *Ch’eng wei-shih lun* in Western languages. The first is a French translation by the eminent scholar Louis de la Vallée Poussin, published by Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner in 1928 as *Vijñaptimātratā: La Siddhi de Hiuan-Tsang*. It is a very careful translation, copiously annotated and including comments quoted from the Chinese commentary of K’uei-chi. The second is an English translation of Poussin’s French translation by Wei Tat, *Ch’eng Wei-Shih Lun: Doctrine of Mere Consciousness*, published in Hong Kong in 1973 by the Ch’eng Wei-Shih Lun Publication Committee. It is a faithful rendering of the Poussin translation. Both translations leave much to be desired in that they leave almost all Sanskrit technical terms untranslated. Finally, there is a very useful commentary on the text by K’uei-chi, the *Ch’eng wei-shih lun shu-chi* (Taishō No. 1830). It is indispensable for an understanding of many very difficult passages in the text, and I have benefitted greatly from both it and Poussin’s notes.

Francis H. Cook
Riverside, California
April 1991

Introduction

Homage

I render homage to those purified wholly or in part
through consciousness only.

1a

I shall explain what has been said for the benefit
and joy of beings.

Purpose of This Book

Vasubandhu composed the [Treatise] “Thirty Verses” for those who are deluded about or deny the two kinds of emptiness (*śūnyatā*), so that they may arouse correct understanding. “Correct understanding” means eliminating the two heavy obstacles (*āvaraṇa*). These two obstacles arise as a result of attachment to a self and dharmas. By realizing the two kinds of emptiness, the obstacles are removed, and by removing the two obstacles, one obtains two excellent results: by eliminating the obstacle of passions that lead to rebirth, one realizes true liberation; by eliminating the obstacle to the knowable that hinders true understanding, one obtains great awakening (*mahā-bodhi*).

Also, Vasubandhu composed the Treatise to instruct those who are attached to a self and dharmas and who are deluded about consciousness only, to permit them to reach the two kinds of emptiness and really comprehend the principle of consciousness only. Some are deluded about this principle of consciousness only. Some grasp the external world as not nonexistent, like consciousness. Some grasp

internal consciousness as nonexistent, like the external world. Some grasp the various kinds of consciousness as being the same in substance but different in characteristics. Some believe that there are no separate mental functions apart from the mind. This Treatise was composed in order to refute these views and to allow people to acquire a correct understanding of the profound and wonderful principle of consciousness only (*viññapti-mātratā*).

.

Chapter I

Attachment to Self and Attachment to Dharmas

1. Attachment to Self

If nothing exists but consciousness, why do ordinary people and holy teachings say that selves and dharmas exist? The “Thirty Verses” says,

THE METAPHOR OF SELF AND DHARMAS EVOLVES IN
VARIOUS WAYS
UPON THE TRANSFORMATION OF CONSCIOUSNESS. THE
TRANSFORMING CONSCIOUSNESS IS THREEFOLD:
RETRIBUTION, THOUGHT, AND PERCEPTION OF THE
EXTERNAL REALM.

The Treatise says that ordinary people and holy teachings say that selves and dharmas exist; but they do not really exist, because they are only metaphors. SELF means a controlling power. DHARMAS are rules. These take different forms. Various forms of selves include such things as “being” and “living being,” and such things as “stream-winner” and “once returner.” Various forms of dharmas are such things as “substance,” “quality,” “karma,” “aggregates” (*skandha*), “sense bases” (*āyatana*), and “sense fields” (*dhātu*). EVOLVES means that these distinctions occur in accordance with conditions.

If these forms are based on metaphors, how can they be established? These forms are all metaphorical constructions based on the transformations of consciousness. CONSCIOUSNESS means “perception.” Here, in the Treatise, the word “consciousness” also

1b includes mental activities, because they are without doubt associated with the former. TRANSFORMATION means that the substance of consciousness evolves to resemble two parts, because these two [parts, consisting of internal images and perception] arise on the basis of the self-authenticating nature of consciousness. Self and dharmas originate from these two parts, because these two images have no support other than these two parts.

Internal consciousness evolves resembling an external realm. As a result of the power of impressions (*vāsanā*) from imagining a self and dharmas, when the consciousnesses are born, they change into a self and dharmas. Even though the images of this self and dharmas are within consciousness, still, due to imagination, they appear to be external. From beginningless time, sentient beings consider them to be real selves and dharmas as a result of this grasping. One is like a dreamer whose mind, because of the power of the dream, appears in the form of various external things and who consequently considers them to be really external things.

None of these selves and dharmas that the foolish believe in really exist. They are said to be METAPHORS because they are based on nothing but false delusions. Even though these apparent selves and apparent dharmas that are evolutions of consciousness exist, they are not real selves and dharmas. However, they are like manifestations and for that reason are said to be metaphors. An external realm is established on the basis of delusion and hence does not really exist in the same way that consciousness does. Inner consciousness is necessarily generated from causes and conditions and therefore is not nonexistent in the same way that external objects are. In this way, the two extremes of increase and decrease are avoided. The external object is based on internal consciousness and therefore only exists from a worldly point of view. Consciousness is the basis for the conventionally established realm and therefore exists in ultimate truth.

How do we know that the external world does not really exist but that there is an internal consciousness that is born resembling external objects? Because a real self and dharmas cannot be found.

Why can a real self not be found? There are, in short, three theories of what a self is. The first is that the self is eternal, universal, and extended like space. In all situations, it performs actions and experiences pleasure and pain. The second theory is that the self that is grasped is eternal but that it has no fixed extension, because it expands and contracts according to the body's size. The third theory is that the self is eternal but extremely small, like an atom. It resides hidden in the body, where it moves about and performs actions.

The first theory is unreasonable. Why? A self that is eternal, universal, and extended like space could not feel pain and pleasure through the body. And if it is eternal and universal, like space, it cannot move, so how could it perform actions through the body?

Also, is the self the same for all sentient beings or is it different? If it is the same for all, then when one being performs an action, all must perform it, and when one being experiences the results of action, all must experience it. If one being obtains liberation, all must obtain it. This is a big mistake! If, on the other hand, you claim that each being has a distinct self, then the selves of beings must merge together and their substances must be mixed. Also, when one acts and experiences the results, then all must act and receive the results, since all selves occupy the same place. If you claim that the action or result of action of beings is distinct and peculiar to the individual, and thus no error occurs, this is not reasonable, because action, result, and body must be united with all selves. It makes no sense that they belong to one and not another. When one obtains liberation, all must obtain it, because the Dharma practiced and realized would be merged with all selves.

The second theory is likewise unreasonable. Why? If the substance of the self is eternal, it cannot expand and contract in the body, because, expanding and contracting like a bellows, it must not be eternal. Also, if selves correspond to bodies, they must be divisible, so how can the substance of a self be unitary? Consequently, this theory is simply childish nonsense.

The third theory is also unreasonable. Why? If the self is as small as an atom, how can it make a large body move? If you claim that even though it is small, it travels through the body rapidly, moving like a whirling torch, then the self you are attached to is neither unitary nor eternal, because that which comes and goes is neither unitary nor eternal.

There are also three other theories about selves: the self is identical with the aggregates (*skandha*); it is different; it is neither the same as nor different from the aggregates. As for the first, it is not reasonable that the self is identical with the aggregates, because a self that is like the aggregates must not be eternal or unitary. Moreover, internal forms are not a real self because, like external forms, they are substantial. Nor are mind and mental activities a real self, because they do not continue in an unbroken series but rather require a host of conditions to exist. Nor are other forms of karmic predispositions (*saṃskāra*) a real self, because, like space, they are unaware.

The second theory, that the self is different from the aggregates, is also unreasonable, because [being formless] like space, it can neither act nor experience the results of action. Finally, the third theory, that the self is neither the same as, nor different from, the aggregates, is also unreasonable, because by saying that the self is based on the aggregates but is neither identical with them nor different from them, the self would be something like a pot and not a real self. Also, since it cannot be said that the self either acts or does not act, it cannot be said to be either a self or not a self. Therefore the real self that is grasped does not exist.

Also, does this real self that is grasped think or not? If it thinks, then it is not eternal, because thought does not take place at all times. If it does not think, then, like space, it cannot act or experience the results of action. Therefore this self does not agree with reason.

Also, does this self that is grasped act or not? If it acts, then, like hands and feet, it is not eternal. If it does not act, then, like the horns of a rabbit, it must not be real. Therefore both theories about the self are invalid.

Also, is this truly existing self the object of the “view of self” (*ātma-dṛṣṭi*) or not? If it is not, how can you say that there is a truly existing self? If it is the object of the view of self, then there must exist a view of self not included among the perverted views (*viparyāsa*), because then it would be true knowledge. If that is the case, how do you explain the fact that the supreme doctrine of those who presumably advocate a real self all denounce the view of self and extol the view of no self, saying that those who see no self realize *nirvāṇa*, while those who are attached to a view of self transmigrate in the realm of birth and death? How can a person with a perverted view attain *nirvāṇa* and one with a correct view transmigrate in the realm of birth and death? 2a

Moreover, none of the various views of a self has as an object a real self, because they all have objects no different from any object of the mind. The perceived object of the view of self is definitely not a real self, because it is an object, like any other object. One actually sees only the aggregates that evolve from consciousness and, in accordance with one’s own delusions, interprets them in various ways.

2. Cessation of Attachment

Attachment to a self takes two forms: innate, and resulting from imagination. Due to the power of the inner causation of false perfuming that has existed since beginningless time, innate attachment is always present in the individual and does not depend on false teachings or imagination but rather occurs spontaneously. That is why it is said to be innate. It takes two forms. The first form of innate attachment is constant and continuous and resides in the seventh consciousness. It takes as an object the eighth consciousness and produces an image that is natural to the mind which it clings to as a self. The second form is intermittent and resides in the sixth consciousness. It takes as an object the images of the five aggregates that are grasped (*upādāna-skandha*) that evolve from consciousness, either individually or wholly, and produces

an image that is natural to the mind which it clings to as a self. These two forms of attachment are subtle and difficult to eliminate. They are only eliminated at a later time on the path of cultivation (*bhāvanā-mārga*) through the repeated cultivation of the eminent contemplation of emptiness [of the self].

Attachment to a self resulting from imagination is the result of the power of present, external conditions and is therefore not innate. It derives from false doctrines and false imagination for its existence, hence the name "imagination." It only exists in the sixth consciousness, or *mano-vijñāna*. It also takes two forms. The first occurs when the sixth consciousness takes as an object images of the aggregates discussed in a false teaching, produces an image that is natural to the mind, and, through imagination and speculation, clings to it as a real self. The second has as its object the image of a self spoken of in a false teaching, produces an image that is natural to the mind, and clings to it as a real self. These two kinds of attachment are gross and therefore easy to eliminate. When one first enters the path of insight (*darśana-mārga*), one contemplates true reality as the natural emptiness of all dharmas and eliminates this attachment.

Thus all these attachments to a self exist in connection with aggregates within the mind but not to aggregates external to mind. They always exist in connection with aggregates internal to mind. Therefore attachment is always wholly directed to the images of the five aggregates that are clung to, which are erroneously grasped as a self. However, the images of the aggregates are wholly produced from conditions and therefore have an illusory existence. The self that is falsely grasped is an unreasonable speculation and therefore definitely is nonexistent. Therefore a scripture says, "You should know, monks, that the view of a self of the Brahmins and *śramaṇas* originates in the five aggregates that are grasped."

2b It may be asked, if there is no self, how do you account for such things as recollection, perception, repetition, volition, anger, and so forth? We reply that if the self that is grasped is eternal and unchanging, it must be the same before and after, and hence

recollection must not exist. Also, if it is the same before as it is after, then recollection, etc., must already exist in the prior state, because its substance would be the same in prior and subsequent states. If it is claimed that although the function of the self changes from state to state the substance remains unchanged, this is unreasonable, because function is not separate from substance and therefore should always exist. Also, if substance does not differ from function, it must not be constant.

However, all sentient beings possess a fundamental consciousness that is homogeneous, continuous, and contains seeds [of all dharmas]. This consciousness and all dharmas act upon each other, and due to the power of perfuming (*vāsanā*), such things as recollection, perception, etc., can exist. Therefore difficulties concerning recollection, etc., are in your tenets, not in ours.

[Or it may be asked,] if there is no real self, who performs acts and experiences the results of action? We reply, since the self that you grasp is said to be unchanging, it is like space. How could it perform actions and experience the results? If, on the other hand, it does change, it must not be eternal. However, because of the power of causes and conditions of the minds and mental activities of sentient beings, the performance of action and experience of results continues without cessation, and so there is no contradiction with reason.

[Or it may be asked,] if the self is really nonexistent, who transmigrates being born and dying in the various planes of existence? Who has a distaste for suffering and seeks *nirvāṇa*? [We reply,] since the self that you grasp is itself birthless and deathless, how can you say that it transmigrates in the realm of birth and death? Your self must resemble space. It is not tormented by suffering, so how can it detest suffering and seek *nirvāṇa*? Thus your claim turns upon itself in self-contradiction. Sentient beings are continuous series of psychical and physical states, and by the power of passions and actions, these series turn toward various planes of existence. Because they are tormented by suffering, they seek *nirvāṇa*. As a consequence of this, you should realize that there is

no real self, only various consciousnesses. From beginningless time, the former [mental state] disappears and a succeeding [state] appears, and thus there is a continuous series of causes and results. As a result of false perfuming [by false notions], something resembling a self appears. The foolish mistake what is falsely grasped for a real self.

3. Attachment to Dharmas

Why is it that apart from consciousness, no real dharmas can be found? Because the real dharmas grasped by non-Buddhists and other vehicles [of Buddhism] do not exist from the standpoint of reason. Why are those grasped by non-Buddhists nonexistent?

The Sāṃkhyas believe in a self that is intelligent and that uses twenty-three dharmas, such as *Mahat*, etc., which in turn are composed of the three qualities of *rajas*, *sattva*, and *tamas*. Although composed of the three qualities, *Mahat*, etc., are real and not fictitious, and are known by direct perception. This tenet is unreasonable. Why? Because *Mahat*, etc., are made up of a plurality of things, like an army or forest, and are therefore fictitious. How can it be claimed that they are known by direct perception? Moreover, if *Mahat*, etc., are real, they must not be composed of the three qualities of *sattva*, etc., just as the latter themselves are not so composed. Since the three qualities, *sattva*, etc., are the same as *Mahat*, etc., then like *Mahat*, etc., they ought to be composed of the three. By analogy, since they change, they are not eternal.

Also, the three elements of *sattva*, etc., act in many ways and therefore should have multiple substances, since there is no difference between substance and function. Also, since the three substances are all-pervasive, then when they change in one place, they should change elsewhere, because their substances are not distinct. If it is admitted that the substance and characteristics of the three elements are different, how can they combine and create a single characteristic [such as firmness, etc.]? They must not be able to create a single characteristic when they combine, because then their substance is no different from what it was prior to

combination. If it is claimed that the substance of the three elements differs but the characteristics are the same, this is self-contradictory, because you claim that substance and characteristics are the same. Substance must be like character, obscurely one and the same. Character must be like substance, obviously threefold. Therefore it cannot be claimed that three elements combine to form a single thing.

Also, the three elements (*sattva*, etc.) are all distinct, while *Mahat*, etc., are all synthetic [compounds of the three elements]. Since the particulars and their compounds are the same, they can be neither one thing nor three. If the three elements do not combine and form a unity when they change, they must remain the same as before the change. How then could they be perceived as a single color, etc.? If the three elements do combine and form a single characteristic, they lose their respective unique characteristics and accordingly lose their own substances.

Nor can it be said that each of the three elements has a dual character, a particular character and a general one. Since the particular and general are the same, the general will be threefold, so how can a unity be perceived? If it is claimed that the substance of each element has three characteristics, but that it is difficult to distinguish the combined mixture, so that they appear as a unity, then since there are three characteristics, how do they appear as a unity? Again, how do we know that each of the three is different? If each element possesses three characteristics, then each must be able to create a color or the like, so why is it necessary for the three elements to unite? Also, since characteristics and substance are identical, then the substance of each element must be tripartite, and since *Mahat* and the others are each composed of the three elements, there will be no difference when they evolve. Thus there will be no difference between cause and effect, gross and subtle elements, sense faculties, etc. In that case, one sense organ will perceive all objects, or one kind of object will be perceived by all the different organs. Though the world sees them as different, the animate and inanimate, pure and impure, direct perception

and inference, etc., would not be different. This would be a huge confusion. Therefore the real dharmas of the Sāṃkhyas do not exist, although false notions and speculation take them to be real.

The Vaiśeṣikas believe in many categories (*padārtha*), such as substance (*dravya*), which really exist and which are known by direct perception. This doctrine is untenable. Why? Among the categories are those things that are immutable and eternal, but if they can produce results, they must not be eternal. Because they do accomplish actions, they are like the results they produce. If they do not produce results, then they have no self-nature apart from consciousness, like the horns of a rabbit. As for noneternal elements, if they are corporeal and substantial, they must be extended and divisible, like an army, a forest, etc., and therefore not real existents [but only nominal realities]. If they are not corporeal, like consciousness and its activities, then they must not have any self-nature apart from consciousness.

Moreover, [the four elements of] earth, water, fire, and wind in their doctrine should not be included in the category of corporeal substances, because they are not contacted by bodily organs, as solidity, fluidity, heat, and motion are. And the solidity, fluidity, heat, and motion that they grasp should not be included in the category of noncorporeal elements, because they are contacted by bodily organs, just as earth, water, fire, and wind are. Earth, water, and fire are visible to the eye as green form, etc. This is acknowledged as being green form. Therefore there is no real earth, water, fire, and wind apart from solidity, fluidity, etc., and no one really sees such things as real earth, water, and fire.

Also, in the category of substance there are things that are eternal and corporeal, but since they are corporeal, they must be like gross earth and therefore not eternal. Noncorporeal dharmas among these categories that are sensed by material organs must be corporeal, because it is admitted that they are sensed by material organs, just as earth, water, etc., are.

Also, nonsubstances such as qualities, etc., must not have distinct self-natures apart from consciousness, because they are not

categorized as substances, like the son of a stone woman. Since they are not real substances, they must not have distinct self-natures apart from consciousness, because, like flowers seen in the sky [by someone with an eye defect], they are not categorized as existent things.

The category of “existence” maintained by the Vaiśeṣikas must not possess a distinct self-nature apart from substance, etc., because it is admitted that like substance, quality, etc., it is not nonexistent. If existence exists apart from substance, it must not really exist, because it is admitted that it differs from substance, like things that absolutely do not exist. If existence is not nonexistent and has no separate nature of existence in turn, then why do substance and so on have to have separate natures of existence? And, if there is a separate nature of existence apart from existing things, there must also be a nature of nonexistence apart from nonexistent things. If this is not so, how can the former be so? Therefore this “nature of existence” is mere false speculation. Also, it makes no sense to be attached to “nature of substance, quality, and action” that differ from actual substance, quality, and action. These are not the “nature of substance, quality, and action,” because they differ from substance, just as quality and action do. Also, substance is not substance because it differs from “nature of substance,” just as quality and action do.

Similarly, the nature of earth, etc., in relation to earth itself, etc., can be understood by analogy with the above. Just as the nature of substance, etc., is not distinct from substance, etc., substance, etc., must not be distinct from the nature of substance, etc. If there is a nature of substance distinct from substance, then there must also be a nature of nonsubstance distinct from nonsubstance. If the latter makes no sense, neither does the former. Therefore the issue of identical and different natures is mere supposition.

The category of union (*samavaya*) of the Vaiśeṣikas definitely does not exist, because it is not categorized as being one of the dharmas that exist, and it is like a thing that absolutely does not exist. They claim that substance, etc., is known through direct

3b perception, but we have demonstrated with reason that they are not real. How much less real is this category of union that they admit is not known by direct perception. Even if they establish that union is known by direct perception, it still does not exist, for the same reasons given previously. In fact, the [nine categories such as] substance are not known through direct perception as really existing things apart from consciousness, because they are admitted as being objects that exist in the same way as the hairs of a tortoise. Conversely, the knowledge that has substance as an object is not included in the direct perception that perceives the self-nature of substance apart from consciousness, because this knowledge arises from the convergence of fictitious dharmas, like the knowledge of qualities, etc. We can say the same about all the categories, up to the category of union. It is not included in the direct perception of the self-nature of union apart from consciousness, because it too arises from the convergence of fictitious dharmas, like substance, etc. Therefore the categories of substance, etc., held by the Vaiśeṣikas, are mere speculations based on false notions.

4. The Great Lord, Etc.

According to one doctrine, there is a great, self-existent deity whose substance is real and who is all-pervading, eternal, and the producer of all dharmas. This doctrine is unreasonable. If something produces something, it is not eternal, the noneternal is not all-pervading, and what is not all-pervading is not real. If the deity's substance is all-pervading and eternal, it must contain all powers and be able to produce all dharmas everywhere, at all times, and simultaneously. If he produces dharmas when a desire arises, or according to conditions, this contradicts the doctrine of a single cause. Or else, desires and conditions would arise spontaneously, since the cause [i.e., the deity] is eternal.

Other doctrines claim that there is a great Brahma, a Time, a Space, a Starting Point, a Nature, an Ether, a Self, etc., that is eternal and really exists, is endowed with all powers, and is able to

produce all dharmas. We refute all these in the same way we did the concept of a Great Lord.

There are those [Mimāṃsakas] who hold the opinion that the sound of the Vedas is eternal. Its power acts as an unchanging quantity that reveals all dharmas. Another opinion holds that all sounds are eternal and are revealed in dependence on conditions. Neither opinion is reasonable. Why? Since it is granted that the sound of the Vedas can express, then it must not be eternal, like any other sound. The other sounds [of the second view] are also not the substance of eternal sounds, because, like pots or clothing, they require a number of conditions to exist. There is an opinion [by the Lokāyatikas] that the atoms of earth, water, fire, and wind are real and eternal. These give rise to gross forms. The gross forms thus produced do not exceed the quantity of the cause, and, though not eternal, their substance nevertheless really exists. This opinion is also unreasonable. If the atoms they cling to have parts, like a column of ants, then the substance is not eternal. If they do not have parts, like mind and mental activities, then they are unable to produce gross matter through aggregation. Also, since they produce a result, being like what they produce, how can it be granted that atoms are eternal?

Also, the result that is created does not exceed the quantity of the cause. Thus it must be like atoms and not called “gross form,” and consequently the created form must not be graspable by material organs such as eyes, etc. This contradicts their own tenet. If they claim that the resulting form combines with quantity and thus resembles gross form, though it is actually not, and in this way can be perceived, then this resulting form that they cling to must be coextensive with the cause and, like atoms, uncombined with the quality of quantity. Or else, the atoms must be united with the quantity of grossness, like gross forms, because there must be no distinction of location. If it is claimed that the result pervades its own cause and, because the cause is not single, the result may be called “gross,” then the substance of this result also

must not be single, just as the causes in which it resides are not single, because the location of each must be different. In this case, the result would not even be gross. Consequently, it would not be sensed by a physical organ. If the result combines many parts and forms a gross effect, then the many causal atoms must not be subtle and fine, sufficient to form the object of a sense organ, so of what use would such a result be? Since the result is formed of multiple parts, it must not be eternal, and therefore your former and latter opinions are self-contradictory.

Moreover, both causes and results are impenetrable as masses and cannot occupy the same place, just as two atoms cannot. If it is claimed that the substances of both the cause and the result accept each other and interpenetrate, like sand accepting water and drugs penetrating molten copper, who says that sand and molten copper accept water and drugs? [If this were to occur,] the atoms would separate and alter, and thus they would be neither
3c eternal nor unitary. Also, if the substance of the resulting gross form is unitary, then when you perceive one part, you must perceive all parts, because all parts would be the same. If you do not agree, then your reasoning is faulty; if you do agree, then you contradict fact. Hence this opinion ends in dilemma and goes nowhere. It is mere vain speculation arising from delusion.

However, though there are many theories of actual dharmas among non-Buddhists, they all come down to four types. The first, that of the Sāṃkhyas and others, holds that actual dharmas and the nature of existence, etc., are identical. This theory is unreasonable. Why? Because it must not be that all dharmas are the same as existence, for all would be like existence, without any distinction of substance. This contradicts the theory that the three qualities (*sattva*, etc.), self (*ātman*), etc., are all different in substance. It also contradicts the empirical distinction among dharmas. Also, if colors, etc., are identical with the nature of color, then there must be no distinction such as green, yellow, etc.

The second theory, that of the Vaiśeṣikas, is that actual dharmas and the nature of existence, etc., are definitely different in substance. This is unreasonable. Why? Because it must not be

that all dharmas are not identical with existence. Like something ruined and nonexistent, their substance would be undetectable. This contradicts the Vaiśeṣika theory that the substance of actual things is not nonexistent. Moreover, it contradicts the empirical fact that objects exist. Also, if colors, etc., are not identical with the nature of colors, etc., then, like sounds, etc., they would not be objects of sight, etc.

According to the third theory, that of the Jains, actual dharmas and the nature of existence are both identical and different. This is unreasonable. Why? Because the error of both identity and difference is the same as previous errors of each side respectively. Also, the two characteristics are mutually contradictory, because they differ in substance; and neither identity nor difference could be established if their substance were identical. It must not be that all dharmas are of the same identical substance. On the other hand, it may well be that such distinctions as identity and difference are fictions rather than realities, although they are grasped as real. This principle is definitely not established.

The fourth theory, that of the Ājīvikas, etc., holds that existing dharmas are neither the same as, nor different from, the nature of existence, etc. This doctrine is unreasonable. Why? Because the doctrine of neither identity nor difference is similar to the foregoing doctrine of both identity and difference. Does the statement “neither identical nor different” deny or affirm? If it just affirms, then it ought not to negate both possibilities. If it just denies, then it has nothing to say. Also, if it both affirms and denies, then the two sides cancel each other, and if it neither affirms nor denies, this is frivolous talk. This doctrine of neither identity nor difference also contradicts ordinary understanding that there are things that are identical or different, and it contradicts the Ājīvikas’ own tenet that real dharmas such as forms really do exist. Therefore this doctrine is merely a device to avoid problems, and the wise do not accept it. 4a

Other schools of Buddhism maintain that there are such really existing dharmas as form that are external to consciousness. Why do we deny this? Because form, dharmas unassociated with

mind, and unconditioned dharmas grasped by these schools do not really exist. The form grasped by these schools falls into two groups: those that are resistant and composed of atoms, and those that are not resistant and are not composed of atoms. Resistant forms definitely do not really exist, because the atoms of which they are composed do not really exist. If atoms are mutually resistant, then they are fictions, not realities, like pots, etc. If they are not mutually resistant, they are like nonforms, and hence they could not gather together to form pots, clothing, etc. Also, if atoms have extension, they must be divisible and not real. If they are unextended, then, since they are like nonforms, how can they combine and receive light or cast shadows? When the sun rises and illuminates something like a pillar, the east side and the west side are illuminated and shaded respectively. Since the side that receives light and the side that is shaded are not identical, the atoms are established as being extended. Also, when you see or touch something such as a wall, you can only see one side and not the other. Since the wall and the atoms are identical, the atoms must be extended.

Also, wherever there are atoms, they must have such differences as being above or below, or in one of the four directions. If this is not so, it cannot be said that they gather together and combine. Otherwise, if they interpenetrate, they do not |form as a larger mass and| become gross form. Therefore atoms definitely have extension. If it is claimed that resistant form is identical with atoms, then if atoms are not extended, form will not obstruct or separate things. In this case, it is neither obstructive nor resistant. Therefore the atoms clung to by these schools must have extension, and since they are extended they are divisible and therefore not real. Therefore the reality of resistant form is inadmissible.

How can the five kinds of consciousness [visual, auditory, olfactory, etc.] not have [material] supports or form as objects? It is just that they are not lacking in form as a support but that this form is a transformation of consciousness. That is, when consciousness arises, through the power of internal causes, it transforms

and appears as images, such as eyes, etc., and [external] forms, etc., and on the basis of these images there is a support [which is the organ] and an object [which is the apparent external form] for the senses.

However, the visual faculty, etc., are not known by direct perception. They are inferred by their ability to produce consciousness. They are only powers, not something produced externally [apart from consciousness]. An external resistant form is inadmissible, and therefore it must be the mere transformation and appearance of internal consciousness. When it appears as visual consciousness, for example, it is called the “visual faculty,” because it is the support that generates visual consciousness. An external condition as object, external to visual consciousness, is inadmissible, and therefore it must be granted that the condition as object is the transformation of one’s consciousness. 4b

It is said by the Small Vehicle that that which generates consciousness similar to itself is a condition in the form of an object (*ālambana-pratyaya*). [We reply that] that [condition in the form of object] alone cannot generate consciousness, because it must not be that conditions as cause (*hetu-pratyaya*), etc., are to be called “condition in the form of object” [since they produce consciousness]. [The Sautrāntikas claim that] when the five forms of consciousness, such as visual consciousness, etc., perceive a color, etc., they have as their object nothing but aggregates [of atoms], because they are similar to the image. But the image of the aggregation, being different from the atoms themselves, has no real substance, because when the aggregation is divided, a consciousness similar to the image definitely does not arise. Since the image of this aggregation is not real, it cannot be claimed that it is the condition for the five kinds of consciousness, because something [illusory], like a second moon, cannot generate the five kinds of consciousness.

Nor [according to another school of the Small Vehicle] do all the atoms combine and thus become the condition as object for the arising of each of the five kinds of consciousness, because in that case there is no image of atoms in consciousness. Atoms do not

have the characteristic of the aggregation, because when they are uncombined, that characteristic does not exist. Nor, either combined or uncombined, do the substance and characteristics of atoms have any difference, and therefore just as in an uncombined state, the atoms of form, etc., when combined, are not the object of the five consciousnesses.

There is a theory that individual atoms of form, etc., are not the object of consciousness in an uncombined state, but when combined they evolve and assist each other to produce gross form, and this is the object of consciousness. That form is real and is the object of consciousness. But this is not so, because whether combined or uncombined, atoms retain the same substance and characteristics, and so, since the atoms of, say, a pot or a bowl are the same, there would be no difference when consciousness has them as objects. Also, in a state of combination, each atom loses its characteristics of minuteness and roundness. Nor can consciousness of gross form take as an object smaller forms, because it must not be that a certain consciousness can have as an object the object of another consciousness, and because in that case one kind of consciousness must take as its object that of another consciousness. Even admitting the existence of atoms, these errors persist. How much less are there any atoms external to consciousness. Consequently, we definitely know that images resembling form, etc., which are transformations of consciousness, are the condition as object for consciousness, because the seeing part of consciousness is generated thanks to that image and incorporates it as its own object.

When consciousness evolves, it suddenly produces a single image that may be large or small, but it does not evolve in parts to form a multiplicity of atoms that then combine into an object. Now, a doctrine of Buddhism states that gross form is not a real object. The reason the Buddha spoke of atoms was so that people would reject the notion. He did not mean that form is composed of real atoms.

4c The Yoga masters, relying on conventional thought and wisdom, divide forms of gross matter progressively to the point where it is no longer divisible and conventionally designate what remains

as “atoms.” These atoms are said to be extended but no longer divisible. If they were again divided, atoms would resemble space and could no longer be called “form.” They therefore say that atoms are the limit of form. As a result of this, you should realize that resistant forms appear from the transformation of consciousness and are not composed of atoms.

Form that is not resistant is like resistant form and is not real. Or being like mind and its activities, it is not real form. We must conclude on the basis of reason that resistant form that manifests the characteristics of real form does not exist apart from consciousness. How much less can nonresistant form, not having the characteristics of form, be said to be real form!

5. Indicative and Nonindicative Form

Do not indicative form (*viññapti-rūpa*) and nonindicative form (*avijñapti-rūpa*) really exist? No, they do not really exist. Why? If we grant that bodily indicative form really exists, what is its nature? If you say that it is form, then it does not exist, because, as form, it is divisible, and atoms of length, etc., are not perceptible. If you say that its nature is movement, it again does not exist, because it perishes as soon as it arises and thus does not actually move, and because conditioned dharmas perish without need of a cause, because if perishing required a cause, it would not be perishing. If it is claimed that there is form that is neither evident nor corporeal and is generated by mental activity to move hands, etc., and that this is what is meant by indicative bodily form, this is not reasonable. If it is movement, we have already rejected that previously. If it is the cause of movement, then it would resemble the element of wind [which is responsible for movement], but wind does not indicate, so it cannot be said to indicate. What is more, physical contact is neither good nor bad by nature [and thus cannot indicate]. The same is true of color, smell, and taste, and therefore bodily indicative acts do not exist.

With mind as cause, an image of form, such as a hand, etc., which has evolved from consciousness, is born and perishes in a

continuous series and changes locations as if it really moved. The form of the hand actually indicates mind [as its cause] and is therefore metaphorically designated as “bodily indication.”

Vocal indication does not have the nature of real sound, because sound during an instant does not indicate anything. Also, sound in a continuous series of instants is not real. Also, the reality of external resistant form has already been refuted. However, with mind as cause, something resembling sound evolves from consciousness, appears and disappears in a continuous series, and seems to indicate or inform, and for this reason it is metaphorically designated as “vocal indication” without violating reason.

Now, if indication is not real, how can nonindication be real? However, vows or intentions of good and bad for a certain time could be metaphorically established as being nonindication, with no violation of reason. This means that it metaphorically exists in a situation in which seeds of good or bad volitions increase and grow on the basis of the expression of outstanding physical or vocal acts, or in a situation in which the intention is actually active and stops physical or vocal acts during *samādhi*.

[It is asked,] in the scriptures, the Buddha mentions three kinds of action. Do you not deny this in denying physical and vocal action? [We answer,] we do not deny them; we merely deny that they are form. We say that bodily action is an intention that moves the body, and vocal action is an intention that produces words.

5a Because the two intentions of reflection and judgement are connected with mind and agitate it, they are called “mental acts.” The effect of physical and vocal intention is called “action” (*karma*). We speak of action as a “path” because it is traversed by the intentions of reflection and judgement, and because it is a path that leads to the production of the fruit of retribution of pain and pleasure. Therefore intention is the essence of the first seven paths of karma. Alternately, we may also speak of physical and vocal indications resulting from intention as action, and because they travel the path of intention we refer to them as “paths of action.” Consequently, you must realize that there is no real external form but only internal consciousness that evolves resembling form.

6. Dharmas Unassociated with Mind

Also, forces not associated with mind (*citta-viprayukta-saṃskāra*) do not really exist. Why? Because such dharmas as “acquisition” (*prāpti*) and “nonacquisition” (*aprāpti*) do not have substances or characteristics that can be perceived in the way that form, mind, and mental activities can; and besides, no function of their own distinct from form, mind, and mental activities can be found. Consequently, you must realize that they definitely do not exist. They are established metaphorically on the basis of states of form, mind, etc. They definitely do not have real substances or functions apart from form, mind, and mental activities, because they are admitted as belonging to the category of aggregates (*skandha*), such as form, etc. Or, they do not really exist, like things that are absolutely nonexistent, because they are not categorized as mind, mental activities, form, or unconditioned [dharmas]. Or, they do not exist, because like other fictitious entities they are not included among other real dharmas.

How do [the Sarvāstivādins, etc.,] know that acquisition and nonacquisition have real substances and functions apart from form, mind, etc.? Because a scripture says, “Such a person acquires good and bad, but the worthy one [the arhat] acquires (*prāpti*) the ten dharmas of the post-learner stage.” It also says, “Ordinary people do not acquire noble dharmas, and a worthy one does not acquire afflictions.” It is said that this language of “acquires” and “does not acquire” refers to acquisition and nonacquisition.

The scripture in question does not say that acquisition and nonacquisition have real substances and functions apart from form, mind, etc., so the proof is inconclusive. The scriptures say that a world-conquering monarch acquires the seven treasures, but how can one acquire the body of another or inanimate objects? If it means that the king exercises power over the treasures and in that sense “acquires” them, then is this not also so of such things as good and bad? Also, if, in clinging to a real acquisition, it is said that the treasures can be said to be acquired because they are actually present, then how would you know that the good and bad dharmas that you

can obtain exist apart from the present moment? In reality, real dharmas do not exist apart from the present, and these present dharmas contain the seeds of good [and bad]. Also, what are the specific functions of acquisition as far as dharmas are concerned? If it is claimed that [acquisition] produces dharmas, it ought to be able to produce unconditioned dharmas, and, also, inanimate things would never be produced [because they lack acquisition]. Also, what has never been acquired or has been lost would remain forever unproduced. If the cause for birth [of dharmas] is an acquisition born with them, then the two births would have no function. In the case of someone possessing good, bad, or indeterminate dharmas, these would be present instantly, and if they require conditions to be present, then acquisition serves no purpose. If it is claimed that acquisition is the cause for the nonloss of dharmas, because sentient beings attain these dharmas through acquisition, we answer that dharmas that can be acquired are never separate from beings. If these were separate, they could never be acquired. Consequently, acquisition serves no purpose with regard to dharmas because it does not exist, and neither does nonacquisition.

However, in relation to states of dharmas that sentient beings may attain, we may conventionally establish three kinds of acquisition: (1) that attained as a result of seed impressions; (2) that attained through sovereignty; and (3) that attained through actuality.

In contradistinction to acquisition, there is something we can provisionally designate as nonacquisition. There are numerous types. The name is given provisionally to that state in which the seeds that are to be destroyed in the path of insight are not definitively destroyed. We call this the “stage of ordinary beings” because the dharma of sainthood has not yet been acquired.

Again, we ask [the Sarvāstivādins], how do you know that there is a real thing called “similarity” (*sabhāgatā*) apart from form, mind, etc.? [They answer,] because a scripture speaks of “similarity of celestials,” “similarity of humans,” etc. But, [we reply,] the scripture does not say that there is real “similarity” apart from form, mind, etc., and so your proof is inconclusive. If it is claimed

that it exists because it is the cause for similar knowledge or similar speech, then grass and trees should have it. Also, if the same knowledge or speech arises as a result of similarity, then similarity ought to have a separate similarity. However, since this is not so, how can you claim that it is real? If it is claimed that it is the cause for similar affairs and desires, this is unreasonable. Similar affairs and desires have as a cause the habits of former lives. What is the need for some separate dharma that you call “similarity”? The fact is that by the term “similarity” we metaphorically designate those physical and mental characteristics that are common to living beings of different kinds.

Also, [we ask the Sarvāstivādins,] how do you know that there is a real vital principle (*jīvitendriya*) apart from form, mind, etc.? [They reply,] because a scripture speaks of “life, heat, and consciousness,” and you should know that the vital principle is what is referred to here as “life.” But, [we reply,] the scripture does not say that there is a real life substance apart from form, mind, etc., so your proof is inconclusive. Also, we have already demonstrated that there is no real form apart from consciousness, so you must assume by analogy that there is no separate vital principle apart from consciousness.

Moreover, if a real vital principal exists apart from consciousness, then it must be like feeling, etc., and not a real vital principle. Why then does the scripture speak of “life, heat, and consciousness”? It speaks of these three in order to distinguish the meaning of consciousness, just as it speaks, for instance, of the “four perfect relinquishments.” [The Sarvāstivādins ask,] but when one is in the trance state of unconsciousness, must one not be without life and heat? [We reply,] does the scripture not say that consciousness does not leave the body? [They ask,] then why does the scripture speak of an unconscious state? [We reply,] in that state, the evolving consciousnesses are suppressed, but not the *ālaya* [consciousness]. Later, we shall discuss the reasons for the existence of this consciousness. This consciousness is sufficient to act as the substratum for the three realms, the six paths of existence,

and the [four forms of] birth. Because it is universal, is constantly continuing in a series, and is the fruit of the maturation of causes, there is no need to cling to a separate vital principle. The truth is that the term “vital principle” refers to powers or abilities of various kinds that result from action and that are supported by seeds that engender the eighth consciousness; and these powers enable form, mind, etc., to endure for a time.

Again, how do you [Sarvāstivādins] know that the two attainments of unconsciousness [in *samādhi*] and the fruits of the meditative state of no thought have real natures apart from form, mind, and other dharmas? [They reply,] if they do not have real natures, then they would be unable to suppress mind and its activities and prevent their occurrence. [We reply,] if in the state of no mind there are separate, real dharmas different from form, mind, etc., that can suppress the mind, then when one is formless [in the formless realm], there must be separate, real dharmas apart from form, mind, etc., named “formless attainments” that can obstruct form. Since this is not so, how can your statement be true? Also, why are real dharmas necessary to suppress the mind? Objects of merely nominal existence, like dams and dikes, can impede.

In cultivating meditation at the stage of equipment (*sambhāra-mārga*), one becomes disgusted with gross, active states of mind and mental activities, and, as a result of putting forth a supreme resolution, one makes mind and its activities become gradually finer and more subtle. When the mind is extremely fine, it perfumes the consciousness as retribution and creates extremely potent seeds of thought of disgust, etc. Because of these seeds of thought of disgust, etc., gross and active states of mind are for a time no longer present. The two *samādhis* result from dividing this state. Since the seeds are good, the *samādhis* are also said to be good.

Prior to the attainment of no thought, one seeks the result, no thought, and therefore the seeds created by perfuming provoke consciousness as retribution. This state is such that gross and active thoughts become inactive, and this state is conventionally called “no thought.” It gets the name “retribution” because it is

founded on retribution [i.e., the store consciousness]. Therefore these three dharmas [of the attainments] do not really exist.

Again, we ask, how do you know that the various characteristics of conditioned dharmas have a real nature apart from form, mind, etc.? [They reply,] because a scripture says so. According to this scripture, there are three characteristics of conditioned dharmas, and it continues to discuss them at length. [We reply that] this scripture does not say that they have a real nature apart from form, mind, etc., so your proof is inconclusive. The [grammatical] genitive relationship [between characteristics and dharmas] does not signify a different substance, because the substance of form and mind is identical with form and mind. You cannot clearly distinguish the substance of that which can characterize from that which is characterized, because the characteristics of conditioned dharmas, such as solidity, etc., are not different from earth, etc. If the characteristics of conditioned dharmas are different from the characterized substance, then the substance of the characteristics of unconditioned dharmas will not differ from what is characterized.

But, [it is argued,] if characteristics such as birth, [duration,] etc., and their substances always exist simultaneously, then all the characteristics will always function simultaneously. If it is claimed that the characteristics are contradictory, they cannot function simultaneously. [We reply,] since their substances are contradictory, how can they exist simultaneously? Also, the functions of duration, change, and extinction must not be simultaneous.

[The Sarvāstivādin replies,] the substance of characteristics and what is characterized always coexist. This must also be true of their function, because it has no separate nature. [We reply,] if it is claimed that their functioning requires causes and conditions, then the causes and conditions must not always exist. Moreover, your concept of "birth," etc., would serve no purpose. If those things that are characterized are united with characteristics such as birth, then those things that are unconditioned must also be provided with birth, [cessation,] etc. It is not clear why the one should require them and not the other.

6a

Also, [regarding the three characteristics of birth, duration, and cessation that supposedly belong to all conditioned dharmas,] past and future times are neither present nor eternal, like illusory flowers seen in the sky, which do not exist. Birth is called “existence,” so how can it exist in the future [which does not yet exist]? Cessation is nonexistence, so it must not exist at present. If cessation is not nonexistence, [as claimed by the Sarvāstivādins,] then birth must not exist. Also, since cessation contradicts duration, how could they exist simultaneously? If duration does not contradict birth, how do they contain different times? Thus these theories pose dilemmas and are unreasonable.

The correct explanation is this: through the power of causes and conditions, dharmas that do not exist are brought into existence. They endure for a while and then revert to nonexistence. To distinguish them from unconditioned dharmas, we conventionally attribute four characteristics to conditioned dharmas. When a dharma that originally did not exist now exists, we refer to this state as “birth.” When the dharma endures for a while, we refer it as “duration.” The change of the enduring dharma from earlier to later states is called “differentiation.” After existing for a while, it reverts to nonexistence, and this state is called “cessation.” The first three states are states of existence and occur in the present. The last state is one of nonexistence and therefore is in the past.

But, [it is asked,] how can nonexistence be a characteristic of [a dharma that] exists? [We reply,] what is wrong with indicating a future nonexistence as a characteristic? “Birth” means that a present dharma did not exist previously. “Cessation” means that a present dharma will be nonexistent later. “Differentiation” means that the dharma is not static. “Duration” means that this dharma is active for a while. Therefore even though these four characteristics designate and indicate conditioned dharmas, they indicate differences [in their state]. Therefore in accordance with their momentariness, we designate them conventionally as these four characteristics, or they can be conventionally designated as lasting for a period of time. The beginning of the dharma’s career is

called “birth”; later nonexistence is “destruction”; born, an apparent series is called “duration”; since the series evolves and changes, we speak of “differentiation.” Therefore we conventionally speak of four characteristics.

Again, [we ask the Sarvāstivādins,] how do you know that apart from form, mind, etc., there are really existing expressive entities called names, phrases, and syllables? [They reply,] because a scripture says so. According to a scripture, “the Buddha acquired extraordinary names, phrases, and syllables.” [We reply,] this scripture does not say that there are real names, phrases, and syllables apart from form, mind, etc. Your proof is inconclusive. If names, phrases, and syllables really exist apart from sounds, then, like color, etc., they do not express. If you say that sound can produce names, phrases, and syllables, this sound must possess inflections of tone, and this alone suffices to express, so what is the use of names, phrases, etc.? If you say that inflections of tone in sounds are themselves names, phrases, and syllables, and that they exist separately from sound itself, we reply that the modifications of shape and quantity in visible form would be different from form and have real, distinct substances. If you say that the inflections of tones in sound do not express, just as sounds of a lute string or a flute do not, we answer that like that sound, inflections of voice do not produce names, etc. Also, who says that the voice alone definitely does not express?

6b

[The Sarvāstivādins reply,] if sound by itself can express, then the sound of such things as wind-bells must have the function of expressing [which sounds unreasonable]. [We reply that] inflections of tone, just as with a flute, must not separately produce real names, phrases, and syllables. If only the sounds of speech can produce names, etc., then why not just admit that words alone can express? [The Sarvāstivādin asks,] by what principle are you so certain that it is the words that express? [We reply,] how do you know that apart from words there exist separate entities that express? That words and expressers are the same, all humans and celestials know. He who grasps things that express apart from words must be crazy.

[The correct position is that] in accordance with different states of vocal sounds, names, phrases, and syllables are conventionally established. Name expresses the essential nature of something, phrases express differences, and syllables are words that support names and phrases. Even though these three have no distinct substance apart from sound, the difference between conventional and real remains, and these three are not like sound [which is real].

In our system, there is a difference in the objects of the two kinds of all-pervasive analytical cognition, and therefore sound, along with names, etc., is included in the aggregates, sense bases, and sense fields (*skandha*, *āyatana*, *dhātu*) and differs in each. Furthermore, it is only in this Buddha-world that we conventionally establish names, phrases, and syllables as dependent on sound. It is not the case in other Buddha-worlds, because in those worlds, these three are established in dependence on light, odor, taste, etc.

There is also a theory among some Buddhists that the propensities (*anuśaya*) differ from mind and its activities and are not included among dharmas associated with mind. This is not reasonable, because those passions that are also *anuśayas* are not unassociated with mind. There is also a theory that there are other dharmas unassociated with mind, but this can be refuted by the same principle as before.

Also, the theory that there are real unconditioned dharmas apart from form, mind, etc., is unacceptable. Dharmas that exist can be classified in three ways: (1) dharmas known by direct evidence, such as form and mind; (2) dharmas that are clearly enjoyed, such as pots, clothing, etc.; everyone in the world knows that these things exist, and they do not have to be proved. The third consists of (3) active, functioning dharmas, such as eyes, ears, etc., which we know exist because of the evidence of their functioning. But the world does not know that real unconditioned dharmas exist, because they do not function in the way that eyes and ears do. Besides, if you say that unconditioned dharmas function, then they are not eternal. Therefore unconditioned dharmas cannot be held to exist really. However, since unconditioned dharmas can be

known, and since their nature is revealed through form, mind, and mental activities, you cannot establish a real nature of unconditioned dharmas apart from form, mind, etc.

[Also, with reference to unconditioned dharmas,] is space unitary or not? If its substance is unitary and extends everywhere, then since it harbors and receives forms, etc., then the substance of space must be multiple in accordance with the dharmas that occupy it, because the location occupied by one thing is not occupied by others. If that is not so, then all dharmas would interpenetrate. If, on the other hand, you say that space is not occupied by dharmas, then it cannot harbor and receive them, as in the case of other unconditioned dharmas. Also, is there a space within things or not? If there is there is confusion; if there is not, then space is not pervasive.

[With regard to the other two unconditioned dharmas,] when one division or class of bonds is severed [in the cessation resulting from discrimination (*pratisaṃkhyā-nirodha*)], then if this state is unitary one would obtain cessation as a result of discrimination of all bonds. The same is so of the cessation resulting from the absence of conditions (*apratisaṃkhyā-nirodha*). When a single condition is absent, then if this state is unitary all conditions would be absent. If, however, unconditioned dharmas are multiple, then they will be divided into classes and types and, like form, etc., will not be unconditioned. Moreover, space would not be pervasive and harbor and receive all things. Real unconditioned dharmas clung to by other Buddhist schools must be refuted in the same way. Finally, if you claim that unconditioned dharmas have no causes or effects, then they must be like the horns of a rabbit and nonexistent apart from mind. 6c

Scriptures say that there are [three] unconditioned dharmas: space [and the two kinds of cessation mentioned above]. They are of two kinds. First, we may provisionally grant their existence as dependent on the transformation of consciousness. That is, one has heard the name of space [and the other two dharmas], and the characteristics of space, etc., arise through reflection. Through the

power of habit, when mind, etc., appear, they appear in the form of these unconditioned dharmas. In the absence of change in the characteristics that appear in prior or subsequent appearances, we may conventionally speak of them as “permanent.”

The second kind is that which is conventionally accepted as existing on the basis of the true nature of things (*dharmatā*). That is, the ultimate reality that is revealed by emptiness (*śūnyatā*) and absence of self exists, does not exist, both exists and does not exist, and neither exists nor does not exist. It demolishes the processes of thought and language and is neither the same as dharmas nor different from them, etc. It is the true principle of dharmas, hence it is called the “true nature of dharmas.” It is called “space” because it is free of all impediments. It is called “cessation resulting from discrimination” because through the power of discrimination it ends various impurities and one understands thoroughly. Or, as a result of being revealed by the absence of conditions, it is called “cessation resulting from the absence of conditions.” Feelings of pleasure and pain are removed, so it is called “immovable.” It is called “cessation of thought and feeling” (*saṃjñā-veditā-nirodha*) because thought and feeling are not active. These five unconditioned dharmas are provisionally established on the basis of ultimate reality. But “ultimate reality” itself is merely a provisionally granted name. To refute the idea that it does not exist, it is said to exist. To refute the idea that it does exist, it is said to be empty. But it must not be thought to be empty and illusory, so it is said to be real. Because this principle is not false or erroneous, it is said to be the ultimate nature of everything. It is also called the “ultimate nature of everything” because it is not the same as the real, eternal dharma called “ultimate nature of everything” apart from form, mind, etc., of other schools. Thus none of the above unconditioned dharmas really exists.

Dharmas grasped by non-Buddhist schools and other schools of Buddhism do not really exist apart from mind and mental activities, because they are grasped in the same way that mind and mental activities are grasped by mind itself. The apprehension

that grasps them does not have them as objects, because it grasps, like the apprehension that takes as an object this same intellect. Also, because mind and its activities arise in mutual dependence, they do not really exist, just as magical illusions do not. In order to refute the false attachment to a really existing realm exterior to mind and its activities, we teach that there is nothing but consciousness (*viññaptimātra*). But if one believes that consciousness only really exists, this is no different from attachment to external objects, and it remains attachment to dharmas.

7. Cessation of Attachment to Dharmas

Belief in dharmas is of two kinds: innate, and resulting from imagination. Innate attachment to dharmas results from an innate power of false perfuming existing from beginningless time and is always present in the individual. It does not arise from false teachings or imagination but evolves spontaneously; hence it is called “innate” (*sahaja*). This in turn takes two forms. The first is constant and continuous. It is located in the seventh consciousness (*manas*), which, taking the eighth (*ālaya*) consciousness as its object, produces an image that is natural to the mind and grasps it as a real dharma. The second kind is discontinuous. It is located in the sixth consciousness and takes as its object images of the aggregates, sense bases, and sense fields that evolve from the eighth consciousness. It produces an image that is natural to the mind, wholly or in part, and grasps it as a real dharma. These two forms of attachment to dharmas are subtle and difficult to eliminate. They can only be eliminated later in the ten bodhisattva stages (*bhūmi*) through the repeated cultivation of the most excellent contemplation of the emptiness of dharmas (*dharma-sūnyatā*). 7a

Attachment to dharmas through imagination results from the power of present, external conditions; therefore it is not innate. It results from the presence of false teachings and imagination for it to occur later. Thus it is called “imagination.” It is found only in the sixth consciousness, and it is of two kinds. The first kind takes

as its object the aggregates, sense bases, etc., taught in a false teaching, produces an image that is natural to the mind, and imagines and judges it to be a real dharma. The second kind takes as its object images such as self-nature, etc., taught in false teachings, produces an image that is natural to the mind, and judges such things to be real dharmas. These two forms of attachment are coarse and thus easy to eliminate. They are eliminated upon entrance into the first of the ten bodhisattva stages when one contemplates the true state of things as the emptiness of all dharmas.

Of these different kinds of attachment to dharmas, dharmas external to mind may or may not be grasped, but all dharmas within mind are grasped. Therefore all attachment to dharmas has as an object apparently real dharmas that appear from the mind but are grasped as real dharmas. However, the images of apparently real dharmas are produced from conditions and are therefore like illusory phenomena. These “real” dharmas as objects of attachment are falsely imagined and thus do not really exist. Therefore the Buddha has said, “You should realize, O Maitreya, that objects of consciousness are only the manifestations of consciousness and are dependent upon other dharmas for their appearance, like illusions, etc.”

Consequently, selves and dharmas apart from consciousness, such as are grasped by non-Buddhists and other Buddhist schools, do not really exist. Therefore mind and its activities do not have external dharmas as their condition in the form of object, because the function of taking something as an object must [by definition] have a reality as an object.

A certain present unit of mind and its activities are not the object of another unit of consciousness because they are categorized as being different units of consciousness, resembling dharmas that are not objects. Also, the activities of one group are not the immediate condition for the consciousness of the same group, because they are separate from consciousness itself, resembling other things that are not grasped. Consequently, you must realize that there is no real external realm but only internal consciousness

appearing as if it were an external realm. Thus a verse from a scripture says,

No external realm imagined by the ignorant exists;
Mind is agitated by perfuming and therefore evolves as
objects.

It is objected [by the Vaiśeṣikas] that if there are no real selves or dharmas apart from consciousness, then there can be no metaphorical use of terms [because there would be no basis for the metaphor]. In order for there to be metaphors, there must be real things, something that resembles, and common elements. For instance, you have a real fire, a man who resembles fire, and the common element of fierceness and redness. Thus you can metaphorically say, "This man is a raging fire." Likewise, you can say, "This man is an ox," etc. But if there are no real selves or dharmas, how can terms be used metaphorically? There being no metaphor, you cannot establish resemblance, so how can you claim that mind evolves resembling external objects? [We reply,] your objections are not reasonable, because we have already refuted selves and dharmas that exist apart from consciousness. 7b

Also, to speak of fire metaphorically, whether as a species or as a substance, is unjustified in either case. This principle does not hold even in the case of species, because the qualities of fierceness and redness do not exist in the species [fire]. If you establish a metaphor without any common qualities, you would metaphorically speak of water as fire. If you say that even though fierceness, etc., are not qualities of a species but are never separated from the species, and therefore the use of metaphor is legitimate, this is wrong, because when a human being and fierceness and redness are present but not united, the species [man] does not possess the qualities and the two remain distinct. However, we speak metaphorically of fire in reference to people, and we therefore know that metaphorical expression is not necessarily based on species.

Nor can the principle of metaphorical expression based on substance be established, because qualities such as redness are not

common to both substances. If you claim that fierceness and redness are found in both fire and in men but the substance of each is different because the support is different, then to speak metaphorically without a common substance is to be subject to the same error as before [in reference to species].

If you say that it is possible to speak metaphorically because the qualities of men and fires resemble each other, this is unfounded, because you are speaking of fire in a man, not in his qualities. Consequently, metaphorical expression does not occur on the basis of substance.

Also, it is not reasonable to say that a metaphor requires a real thing [as a basis for comparison], because “reality” means the distinct characteristics (*svalakṣaṇa*), and it is not the object of conventional knowledge and expression. That is, conventional knowledge and expression do not reach the distinct characteristic of the thing. They only function with regard to common characteristics (*sāmānya-lakṣaṇa*) of dharmas. But there is no other way of reaching the object apart from conventional knowledge and expression, so it is agreed that the distinct characteristic is the support of the knowledge and expression. However, conventional knowledge and expression must occur on the basis of sound. However, they do not occur if the sound does not reach the organ. Neither that which expresses nor that which is expressed are the distinct characteristic, and so we say that metaphorical expression does not have a real entity as a support. It only occurs when there is a quasi-entity for the support of a metaphor. “Quasi” means that [the entity] is a superimposition, not a real characteristic. Sound evolves on the basis of the quasi-characteristic of superimposition, and therefore it cannot be claimed that metaphor necessarily has a real thing as its support. Therefore these objections do not conform to proper principles. However, the Buddha has employed metaphorical expressions, such as “dharmas,” in connection with the transformation of consciousness in order to refute the notion of real selves and dharmas. Thus a verse from the *Ghanavyūha Sūtra* says,

To refute real selves and dharmas grasped by the foolish,
He spoke metaphorically of selves and dharmas in
connection with the transformation of consciousness.

Chapter II

The Evolutions of Consciousness

Though the forms of the evolutions of consciousness are many, the consciousness that evolves is of three kinds. The first is called RETRIBUTION OR DIFFERENT RESULTS (*vipāka*); that is, the eighth consciousness, so called because its nature is that of many different results. The second is called THOUGHT; that is, the seventh consciousness (*manas*), because it constantly judges and thinks. The third is called PERCEPTION OF THE EXTERNAL REALM; that is, the first six consciousnesses, because the objects that they perceive are gross. The word AND [in the second stanza of the “Thirty Verses,” see p. 377] shows that the first six consciousnesses form a single form of consciousness. These three together are called the “consciousness that transforms.” It is of two kinds. 7c

The first is transformation as cause; that is, the two causal habit energies (*vāsanā*) of the eighth consciousness: habit energy of similar species (*niṣyanda-vāsanā*) and habit energy of retribution (*vipāka-vāsanā*). Habit energy of similar species is produced and made to grow by good, bad, and indeterminate perfuming influences in the first seven forms of consciousness. Habit energy of retribution is produced and made to grow by impure good and bad perfuming in the first six forms of consciousness.

The second kind, transformation as result (*phala*), means that as a result of the power of the above two forms of causal energy, the eight forms of consciousness are born and exhibit their various characteristics. Because habit energy of similar species is the cause, the substance and characteristics of the eight forms of consciousness are born in their diversity. The name “result of similar

species” (*niṣyanda-phala*) derives from the fact that the result is similar to the cause. Habit energy of retribution is the dominant condition (*adhipati-pratyaya*). It is called “retribution” because of its power to influence the eighth consciousness to repay karma leading to a specific form of rebirth (*ākṣipaka-karma*) from past lives, and because it exists as a continuous series. It also stirs the first six forms of consciousness to repay karma that fills out the details (*paripūraka-karma*) inherited from the past lives. It is called “born of retribution” (*vipākaja*) rather than simply “retribution” (*vipāka*) because it is intermittent. That is, the above “retribution” and “born of retribution” are called “result of retribution” because the result differs from the cause. Here, only the consciousness that harbors self-attachment, holds the impure seeds, and transforms the results is called “retribution.” This does not mean that all forms of consciousness are retribution.

Chapter III

The Store Consciousness (*Ālaya-Vijñāna*)

We have already discussed briefly the names of the three forms of consciousness that transform, but we have yet to discuss their three characteristics. What are the characteristics of the first transforming consciousness? The “Thirty Verses” says,

FIRST, THE *ĀLAYA* IS ALSO RETRIBUTION AND THE HOLDER
OF ALL SEEDS.
THAT WHICH IT GRASPS AND HOLDS, ITS LOCATION, AND ITS
PERCEPTIONS ARE IMPERCEPTIBLE.
IT IS ALWAYS ASSOCIATED WITH MENTAL CONTACT,
ATTENTION, FEELING, CONCEPTUALIZATION, AND VOLITION.
IN IT THE ONLY FEELING IS ONE OF INDIFFERENCE.
IT IS UNDEFILED AND MORALLY NEUTRAL.
AND THE SAME IS TRUE OF MENTAL CONTACT, ETC.
IT ALWAYS EVOLVES LIKE A FLOWING STREAM
AND IS ABANDONED IN THE STAGE OF ARHATSHIP

The first transforming consciousness is called *ālaya* by both the Great and Small Vehicles, because (1) this consciousness stores, (2) it is subject to having seeds stored in it, and (3) it is the store that is the object of attachment. That is, it and moral impurities act as conditions for each other, and sentient beings grasp it as an inner self. The term STORE shows the specific characteristic of this first transforming consciousness, because its specific character is

that of being both cause and effect. Although the states of the specific character of this consciousness are many [depending on the spiritual stage of development], the term **STORE** is used broadly for all its states, because of its serious fault [of storing seeds of future delusion].

It is called **RETRIBUTION** because it is the result of retribution for good and bad action (*karma*) that draws an individual to a certain realm (*dhātu*), destination (*gati*), and form of birth (*yonī*). Apart from it, there is no vital principle or other factor that always continues in an unbroken series and is the dominant fruit of retribution. The term **RETRIBUTION** shows the characteristics of the fruit of this first transforming consciousness. Though there are many states and varieties of fruit of this consciousness, it is referred to broadly as “retribution” and “fruit” because the terms apply to all states, though not common to all.

8a Because this [eighth consciousness] holds all seeds (*bīja*) of all dharmas and does not allow them to be lost, it is called **HOLDER OF ALL SEEDS**. Apart from it, no other dharma capable of holding the seeds of all dharmas can be found. This term **HOLDER OF ALL SEEDS** shows the causal aspect of this first consciousness. Though there are many ways in which consciousness is causal in its nature, nothing else holds the seeds, and for that reason it is called “holder of all seeds.” Though the substance and characteristics of this transforming consciousness are many, it is said that it only has these three characteristics.

1. The Seeds

Now we must specify what is meant by “all seeds.” What are the dharmas that are called “seeds”? They are different energies in the fundamental consciousness that immediately engender their own fruit or results. These seeds are neither the same as, nor different from, the fundamental consciousness and their fruit, because the principle must be so regarding substance and function, and cause and effect. Although they are neither identical with, nor different from, [the eighth consciousness,] they really exist,

because a fictional dharma is as if nonexistent and cannot be a causal condition. [Sthiramati says that] being neither identical with nor different from all dharmas, they must be only conventionally and not actually real, like pots, etc. But if this were so, then ultimate reality (*tathatā*) must also exist only conventionally, and to concede that would mean that there would be no real ultimate truth. However, the seeds are only existent from the point of view of conventional, worldly truth; they are not the same as ultimate reality.

Even though the seeds are supported on the substance of the eighth consciousness, they are nothing but the seen part of this consciousness. [As Dharmapāla] says, this is because the seeing part always takes them as its objects. Because there is no distinction in substance between impure seeds and consciousness as retribution, the seeds are morally indeterminate, but their causes and results are good, bad, etc., and they are therefore said to be “good,” “bad,” etc. Since the pure seeds are not included in the nature of consciousness as retribution, and since their causes and results are categorized as good, then they are said to be only good. But if this is so, why does the *Viniścayaśaṅgraha* [section of the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*] say that all twenty-two faculties (*indriya*) have seeds of retribution and are all born of retribution? Even though they are called “retribution,” they are not indeterminate. They are called “seeds of retribution” because they are supported by the consciousness that is retribution. Different kinds of consciousness support each other, such as visual consciousness, etc. Also, pure seeds get the name “retribution” [or “maturation”] because they mature and evolve through the power of perfuming, but they are not retribution categorized as indeterminate by nature.

2. The Origin of the Seeds

There is an interpretation [by Candrapāla] of the origin of seeds to the effect that all seeds exist naturally and primordially and are not produced by perfuming. They can be said to increase and grow through the power of perfuming. According to a scripture,

“All sentient beings, from beginningless time, have within them diverse kinds of elements (*dhātu*), like seeds in a myrobalan fruit, that exist by the nature of things.” Here, “elements” is another name for seeds. Also, a scripture says, “From beginningless time, elements are the support of all dharmas, etc.” “Elements” mean “cause.” The *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says, “Though the substance of the seeds exists from beginningless time in a natural and fundamental way, they are perfumed and develop anew by pure and impure [actions].” Also, “Beings predestined for *nirvāṇa* possess all the seeds, but if they are not predestined for *nirvāṇa* they lack the seeds of awakening.” Many other texts make similar statements.

8b Also, it is said [in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*] that sentient beings are naturally divided into five families [one of which cannot attain *nirvāṇa*], which must mean that seeds must exist by the nature of things and do not result from perfuming. According to the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*, beings in the purgatories are provided with three pure faculties (*indriya*), but these exist as seeds and not as actual faculties. Another text speaks of natural, innate families [of bodhisattvas, etc.] that exist by the nature of things and continue in an unbroken series from beginningless time. Consequently, as a result of these proofs, pure seeds exist naturally, by the nature of things, and are not born from perfuming. Impure seeds also must be seeds that exist naturally. They increase and grow as a result of perfuming, but are not born from perfuming. Thus cause and effect are established without confusion.

There is also an interpretation [by Nanda and Śrīsenā] that all the seeds are born as a result of perfuming. Both that which is perfumed [i.e., the eighth consciousness] and that which perfumes [i.e., actual dharmas] exist from beginningless time, and therefore there is no beginning for the formation of seeds. Since seeds are another name for “habit energy,” habit energy must exist as a result of perfuming, just as the odor of sesame seeds is produced by the perfuming odor of the flowers.

As a scripture says, “The minds of sentient beings are perfumed by pure and impure dharmas and consequently are accumulations of countless seeds.” A treatise says, “Internal seeds

must be perfumed, but external seeds are sometimes perfumed, sometimes not.” Also, the three kinds of perfuming — names, words, etc. — generally include all the seeds of impure dharmas. Since these three result from perfuming, impure seeds must be born as a result of perfuming. The birth of pure seeds must also be the result of perfuming, because it is said, “When the True Dharma, which flows from the pure realm of the Dharma, is heard, perfuming that results from hearing is produced.” Also, it is the nature of seeds in the mind of one who has transcended the world.

3. Refutation

The distinction of families of sentient beings existing primordially does not result from either the existence or the nonexistence of pure seeds but arises according to whether or not there are obstacles (*āvaraṇa*). According to the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*, “To that class of beings who will not attain *nirvāṇa* belong those who are obstructed by the seeds of the two obstacles to the realm of the ultimate [i.e., moral and cognitive faults]. Those who have the cognitive obstacle to the ultimate but not the [obstacle of the] passions belong either to the family of disciples (*śrāvaka*) or to the family of *pratyekabuddhas*. One without seeds of the obstacles to the ultimate belongs to the family of Tathāgatas.” Thus the distinction of families with different capacities existing from beginningless time is the result of the presence or absence of the two obstacles, not the presence or absence of pure seeds. The reference in the above text [to beings in the purgatories] having pure seeds refers to seeds that will be born, not to already existing seeds.

There is another interpretation [by Dharmapāla], which holds that seeds are of two kinds. The first consists of primordial seeds. This refers to different energies in consciousness as retribution that have existed since beginningless time by the nature of things, and which give birth to aggregates, sense bases, and sense fields. The World-Honored One has accordingly said, “All sentient beings since beginningless time have within them diverse elements

resembling seeds of the myrobalan fruit that exist by the nature of things.” These and other quotations are similar to [Candrapāla’s] earlier statement. These seeds are called “naturally existing seeds.”

8c The second kind of seeds consists of those that originate at some point in time. This means that they exist as a result of perfuming by actual dharmas, repeated over and over since beginningless time. The World-Honored One accordingly said, “Due to perfuming of the minds of beings by good and bad dharmas, they are accumulations of countless seeds.” Various treatises say that pure and impure seeds are born as a result of perfuming by pure and impure dharmas. These seeds are called “seeds created by perfuming.”

[We reply to Candrapāla] that if seeds are only innate and natural, the [first seven] evolving consciousnesses must not be conditions as cause of the *ālaya*. According to a scripture,

Dharmas [i.e., the first seven consciousnesses] approach
(*ālaya*) consciousness;
[*Ālaya*] consciousness approaches the dharmas.
They are reciprocally of the nature of effect,
And always reciprocally of the nature of cause.

The meaning of this verse is that at all times, the *ālaya* consciousness and the first seven consciousnesses generate each in a steady process and are reciprocally cause and effect. The *Mahāyāna-saṃgraha* says, “*Ālaya* consciousness and pure and impure dharmas are reciprocally conditions as cause, just as a candle and a flame produce heat, and just as bundles of reeds support each other. Conditions as cause are found only in the relationship between seeds and *ālaya*, because no other conditions as cause can be found.”

If seeds were not produced as a result of perfuming, how could the first seven forms of consciousness act as conditions as cause for the *ālaya*? These first seven forms of consciousness are not called conditions as cause because they perfume seeds and make them grow, because in that case good and bad actions would be conditions as cause for the fruit of retribution, the eighth consciousness. Also, holy teachings say that there are seeds born of perfuming, and that contradicts this interpretation. Therefore, the

idea that seeds are only natural and innate contradicts reason and scripture.

Also, if seeds only originate with a beginning [and are not innate], there would be no conditions as cause for conditioned, pure dharmas, and therefore they would not originate. Impure dharmas cannot be the causes of pure ones, because a pure seed must not be born from an impure one. To concede that they can would mean that Buddhas would produce impure dharmas again, and good seeds would create bad ones.

4. Originally Pure Mind

The Vibhajjavādins say that the nature of mind is intrinsically pure and is soiled by adventitious defilements [not innate ones], and that for that reason it is called “soiled.” When separated from the passions, it is pure again. Therefore there is a cause for pure dharmas. [We ask,] what does “nature of mind” mean? If it refers to the principle of emptiness (*śūnyatā*), emptiness is not the cause of mind, because an eternal dharma certainly is not the seed of dharmas, because its substance remains unchanged before and after.

Is the nature of mind mind itself? This would resemble the theory of the Sāṃkhyas, which is that although the characteristics of mind change, the substance remains the same. But if it is intrinsically pure, bad or indeterminate minds would remain good, and if you concede that, then mind would be associated with such things as faith. If you do not concede it, then mind does not have the substance of good mind. You could not say it is good, much less pure. The impure but good mind is called “defiled,” and like a bad mind it is not pure by nature. Therefore it cannot be the cause for pure dharmas, because it must not be that good and bad can be causes for each other.

If the nature of an impure mind is pure, then the nature of a pure mind must be impure, because it would be impossible to distinguish causal conditions. What is more, if the minds of ordinary beings are basically pure, then pure dharmas would be active when one is still in the stage of ordinary beings, and such ordinary

9a

beings would be called “holy ones.” And, if you claim that the reason beings are said to be pure is that although the minds of beings are innately pure, the characteristics are impure, but the nature of mind does not have these faults, then the seeds of this mind are not pure. Why does your treatise say that there are ordinary beings who possess pure seeds? The nature and characteristics of seeds and dharmas in activity are the same.

However, when the scripture says that mind is pure by nature, it is referring to the ultimate reality revealed by the emptiness of the mind, because ultimate reality is the mind’s true nature. Or, they mean that because the substance of mind is not afflicted, it can therefore be called “pure by nature.” They do not mean that it is called “fundamentally pure” because the nature of an impure mind is pure.

As a result, we may believe that from beginningless time sentient beings possess pure seeds that are not the result of perfuming, and that they possess them by the nature of things. Later, in the spiritual stage of “Superior Progress,” the pure seeds are made to increase and grow through perfuming. The pure seeds that come into being have these seeds as their cause. When pure dharmas come into being, they subsequently perfume in turn and create new seeds. The seeds of impure dharmas can be understood in the same way.

Even though holy teachings say that the internal seeds are definitely perfumed, they do not say that the seeds are produced as a result of perfuming. How can they be understood to deny natural seeds? However, these natural seeds are made to increase and grow as a result of perfuming and can then produce results. For this reason, these texts say that internal seeds are perfumed.

[The *Mahāyānasamgraha* says that] perfuming produced from hearing [the Dharma] is not simply impure [when occurring in an ordinary person]. [We reply that] when one hears the True Dharma, innate pure seeds are made to increase gradually and develop to the point where they produce a supramundane thought; for that reason, texts speak of these seeds as “perfumed by hearing.” The impurity of perfuming by hearing is eliminated at the stage of

cultivation. This perfuming results in a superior retribution with respect to supramundane dharmas, and it is a superior dominant condition (*adhipati-pratyaya*). On the other hand, the purity of this perfuming by hearing is not to be eliminated [at the stage of cultivation] and is properly the condition as cause (*hetu-pratyaya*) of supramundane dharmas. This proper condition as cause is subtle, obscure, and difficult to comprehend. These texts are only concerned with gross, obvious dominant conditions and therefore say, as an expedient, that these conditions are the seeds of supramundane thought.

5. Families and Seeds

As for the idea of families being distinguished on the basis of obstacles, the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says that families of beings are distinguished according to the presence or absence of pure seeds. That is, if one is wholly lacking in pure seeds, the seeds of the two obstacles can never be destroyed, and that puts one in the family of those who will never attain *nirvāṇa*. If one possesses the pure seeds of the two vehicles, the seeds of the obstacle to that which is to be known can never be destroyed, and part of this family is assigned to the family of disciples (*śrāvaka*) and part is assigned to the family of *pratyekabuddhas*. If one possesses the pure seeds of a Buddha, both obstacles can be destroyed, and one is assigned to the family of Tathāgatas.

Consequently, whether or not the [two] obstacles can be removed depends on the presence or absence of pure seeds. However, pure seeds are subtle, obscure, and difficult to comprehend, and therefore this treatise distinguishes families on the basis of [the more obvious causes of] obstacles. If it were not for pure seeds, what other cause would there be for the destructibility of the obstacles? If you say that the obstacles exist naturally, then why not admit the same possibility for the seeds of pure dharmas? 9b

If seeds of pure dharmas are fundamentally and wholly non-existent, then the holy paths will not arise. Who then will be able to destroy the seeds of the two obstacles, and how could it be said

that families are distinguished on the basis of obstacles? Since the holy paths could not arise, it makes no sense to claim that it would.

But, in place after place in the scriptures, it is said that there are innate seeds, and all contradict this position of the *Yogācāra-bhūmi Śāstra*. Therefore, to say that seeds are only born at some moment in time contradicts reason and scripture. Consequently, you must understand that seeds are of two kinds: the innate, and those that originate in time.

6. The Characteristics of Seeds

In summary, seeds have six characteristics.

(1) They are instantaneous. Only those things can be seeds whose substance perishes without interval as soon as they are born and that possess superior power. This excludes eternal dharmas, because they are eternal and changeless and therefore cannot be said to have the ability to generate activity.

(2) Seeds exist simultaneously with their fruit. Only those things that are present with the fruit already functioning actively and in union with it can be seeds. This excludes dharmas prior to or anterior to the fruit, as well as those that are not related to the fruit. Actualities and seeds of dissimilar species can coexist with no contradiction. Within an individual, seeds presently existing coexist with the generating power. They are unlike seeds of the same kind, which, being mutually contradictory, cannot coexist. Even though the cause may or may not exist simultaneously with the result [in different cases], still only those present can exert a causal function, because dharmas that do not yet exist or that have already perished have no self-nature. The term “seed” applies to those things that produce actual, present dharmas, not to things that produce their own kind, and hence it must be said that a seed exists simultaneously with its resultant fruit.

(3) Seeds always continue in a series. Only those things are seeds that continue in a single species over a long time, until the bodhi-sattva reaches the ultimate stage of development. This excludes the [first six] evolving consciousnesses that change and are discontinuous,

because they are not associated with seeds. This expression shows that seeds of the same species are produced in a series.

(4) The nature of seeds is determinate [as to moral species]. Those things are seeds that produce good, bad, and indeterminate [actual dharmas] according to the power of the [seed] causes. This excludes doctrines of other schools of Buddhism that hold that a cause of one nature can have a causal relation to a result of another nature.

(5) Seeds require multiple conditions. Only those things are seeds that require a number of conditions uniting so that their power is overwhelming. This refutes the non-Buddhist idea that a spontaneous cause produces a result suddenly, without need for other conditions. It also excludes other Buddhist doctrines to the effect that conditions are always present. This characteristic shows that the required conditions are not always present, and therefore seeds do not always produce their fruit suddenly.

(6) Seeds attract their own results. Those things are seeds that attract results such as form, mind, etc., in accordance with the specific type of causal seed. This excludes the non-Buddhist idea that a single cause may produce all results of all kinds. This also excludes other Buddhist ideas to the effect that form, mind, etc., are causes for each other. Those, and only those, are seeds that exist as species of potentialities within the fundamental [store] consciousness and that satisfy these six requirements. Seeds external to consciousness, such as wheat seeds, rice seeds, etc., are developments of consciousness itself and, though referred to metaphorically as “seeds,” are not real seeds. 9c

The power of these seeds to produce a proximate or true fruit is called the “productive cause” (*abhinirvṛtti-hetu*). The power of these seeds to attract distant and decaying fruits and prevent them from perishing immediately is called the “attracting cause” (*avahāka-hetu*).

7. Internal and External Seeds

Internal seeds must be perfumed in order to arise and mature and for new seeds to produce fruits. These are the conditions as cause.

External seeds may or may not be perfumed. These are the dominant conditions for the fruit. The real causes of resulting dharmas are the internal seeds, because they are fruit born of seeds of like characteristics [in the store consciousness].

8. Perfumer and Perfumable

On the basis of what characteristics can we speak of “perfuming”? We speak of “perfuming” on the basis of four characteristics of that which is perfumed and that which perfumes that cause seeds to be born and grow. What are the four meanings of “perfumable”? First, with regard to that which is perfumable, it is enduring. It is perfumable if a dharma continues from beginning to end as a single kind in an unbroken series and can for that reason hold perfuming. This excludes the [first six] consciousnesses, as well as wind, sound, etc. They are not enduring by nature and therefore not perfumable.

Second, the dharma that is perfumable is indeterminate. It is perfumable if it is neither morally good nor bad, does not conflict with good or bad, and holds perfuming. This excludes good and bad, which, being strong by nature, cannot hold perfuming and therefore are not perfumable. Consequently, this excludes the purified eighth consciousness of a Tathāgata, which holds old seeds but does not receive new perfuming.

Third, it is perfumable by nature. It is perfumable if it is independent and not resistant and dense. This excludes mental functions and unconditioned dharmas, which are not perfumable because they are, respectively, dependent [on consciousness *per se*] and immutable.

Fourth, it is in close union with the perfumer. A dharma is perfumable if it exists simultaneously with that which perfumes, shares the same place, and is neither the same nor different. This excludes the bodies of others, and prior and subsequent moments, because there is no union. These are not perfumable. Only the [eighth] consciousness as retribution, which satisfies these four requirements, is perfumable, not such things as mental activities.

As for the requirements of the perfumer, first, it is born and then perishes. That dharma is able to perfume if it is impermanent, if it can function, and if it produces and nourishes habit energy. This excludes unconditioned dharmas, which never change and do not produce or nourish.

Second, it has a superior functioning. It can perfume if it is born and perishes, has great creative power, and can attract habit energy. This excludes the [eighth] consciousness as retribution and mental activities, etc., because their power is slight and they are therefore unable to perfume.

Third, it increases and decreases. A dharma can perfume if it possesses superior functioning, can increase and decrease, and can hold and implant habit energy. This excludes the perfect, good dharmas of Buddhahood, which neither increase nor decrease and therefore cannot perfume. If they could perfume, they would not be perfect, and the fruit of Buddhahood would consist of different grades of strong and weak in the beginning and later.

Fourth, it is united with that which it perfumes and evolves along with it. A dharma can perfume if it exists simultaneously with the perfumable, exists in the same place, and is neither identical with nor different from it. This excludes other bodies and prior and subsequent moments, where there is no union and hence no ability to perfume.

The only things satisfying these four requirements and thus able to perfume are the first seven consciousnesses and their mental activities, which possess a superior functioning and increase and decrease. Perfuming occurs when these seven forms of consciousness as perfumers are born with and perish with the consciousness that is perfumed. The seeds in the perfumed consciousness are made to be generated and grow, like perfumed sesame, hence the name “perfuming.” 10a

When the consciousness that perfumes, etc., is born from seeds, it is capable of being a cause and perfuming and creating seeds. Three dharmas [the engendering seed, consciousness in action, and the created seeds] evolve together and act as simultaneous

causes and results of each other, just as a candle wick produces flame and flame produces a burning wick, or just as bundles of reeds support each other. Cause and result are simultaneous, with no violation of reason. The perfumer creates seeds, the seeds create actual dharmas, just as the two reciprocal and simultaneous causes produce a result useful to man [according to the Small Vehicle]. Seeds produce other seeds of the same species, which is similar to causes of the same species (*sabhāga-hetu*) attracting results of similar species (*niṣyanda-phala*). These two forms of generation are of the nature of conditions as cause for the result, and apart from them no other dharmas are causes. To call something else a cause is merely a metaphorical use of the term. These are the characteristics of all seeds in summary.

9. Mode of Activity and Perceptions

What is the mode of activity and object [of perception] of this [*ālaya*] consciousness? [Vasubandhu says,]

THAT WHICH IT GRASPS AND HOLDS, ITS LOCATION, AND ITS
PERCEPTIONS ARE IMPERCEPTIBLE.

PERCEPTIONS are its mode of activity, because the mode of activity of this consciousness is to perceive. LOCATION means “place.” It is the world receptacle, because it is the supporting location of sentient beings. THAT WHICH IT GRASPS is twofold: the seeds and the body provided with organs. “Seeds” refer to images, names [or words], and the perfuming of imagination. “Body provided with organs” refers to physical organs and the support of the organs. These two are what is grasped by consciousness. They are incorporated into the substance [of consciousness] and share its tranquility and dangers. Both that which is grasped and the location are its objects.

10. The Two Parts of Consciousness

When, due to the power of causes and conditions, the substance of *ālaya* consciousness is born, it transforms internally into seeds and the body provided with organs, and externally into the world

receptacle. These things that are its transformations become its own object of perception (*ālambana*), because its mode of activity appears in reliance on them. The term PERCEPTION means that the eighth consciousness as retribution has the function of perceiving its objects. The function of perceiving is the seeing part of this consciousness.

When the substance of this consciousness is born in an impure state, it appears resembling two parts: an apparent object or seen part and as the apparent subject or seeing part. The same occurs with mental activities. In short, it appears [when transformed] as both dharmas and as cognition. As apparent object it is the seen part, and as the apparent subject it is the seeing part. If mind and its activities did not have the seen part, they would not have the ability to take their own objective realm as an object. Or, each would take as an object every kind of object, and one objective realm would be like all others. If mind and its activities did not have the seeing part, they would know nothing, just as space does not, or else we would have to concede that space is a knowing subject. Consequently, mind and its activities must have these two parts. As a scripture says, “Everything is consciousness only; there is no |real| object of consciousness. The subjective and objective parts of consciousness evolve naturally.” 10b

11. Three Parts of Consciousness

As for the doctrine that there is an objective realm apart from consciousness, this means that (1) the external realm is the object of consciousness, (2) the seen part of consciousness is its mode of activity, and (3) the seeing part of consciousness is the thing itself, because [seeing] is the character of the very substance of mind and its activities. Mind and its activities have the same support and object, because their mode of activity and objective images are similar. Associated objects are equal in number [i.e., one to one], but their characteristics are different, because [activities of mind such as] consciousness, feeling, thought, etc., are different in their activity.

[However,] if we grasp the fact that there is no objective realm apart from consciousness, then we must say that the seen part of consciousness is the object and the seeing part is the mode of activity. The substance that serves as support for both the seeing and seen parts of consciousness is called the “self-authenticating part” (*svasaṃvitti-bhāga*) of consciousness. If this did not exist, there would be no recollection of mind and its activities, just as there would be no recollection of objects never perceived. Mind and its activities have the same objective basis. The characteristics of their objects are similar, but their modes of activity differ, because the functions of perceptions, etc., are different. The things in question [i.e., consciousness and its activities] are equal in number [one activity, one object], but their characteristics differ, because the substances of consciousness, thought, etc., are different.

When mind and its activities are born one after another, a rational analysis will show that each has these three parts, because the known, the means of knowing, and the fruit of knowing are different, and besides, the image and the knower must have a supporting substance. According to a verse in the *Pramāṇa-samuccaya*,

The image that resembles an external object is the
known object;
That which grasps the image and that which is self-
authenticating
Are the knower and the fruit of knowing.
The substance of these three is not differentiated.

12. Four Parts of Consciousness

If we make an even finer distinction concerning mind and its activities, we can say that there are four parts. Three are as explained above, and the fourth is the part that authenticates self-authentication (*svasaṃvitti-saṃvitti-bhāga*). If this fourth part did not exist, what would authenticate the third part, self-authentication? The knowing part also must be authenticated! Also, the self-authenticating part would have no fruit, and knowers must have results, or fruit. It cannot be said that the seeing part of consciousness is the

fruit of the third part, because the seeing part is sometimes categorized as nondirect perception. Consequently, the seeing part of consciousness does not authenticate the third part, because that which authenticates its own substance must be direct perception.

Of these four parts, the first two are external, and the latter two are internal. The first part [the seen part] is only an object of perception, while the last three are both subject and object. Although the second [seeing] part always has the first part as an object, it may function as a means of knowing or it may not, and sometimes it knows through direct perception and sometimes through inference.

The third part of consciousness can have as its object both the second and the fourth parts. The part that authenticates self-authentication has only the third part as its object, never the second part, because there is no need for it to do so. The third and fourth parts are both categorized as direct perception.

Therefore the mind and its activities are formed from the union of these four parts, which form subject and object, without falling into an infinite regression. They are neither identical nor different, and therefore the principle of consciousness only (*viññaptimātra*) is demonstrated. Thus a verse from the *Ghanavyūha Sūtra* says,

The minds of being are of two natures,
All divided into internal and external.
They are bound up with apprehending and being
apprehended.
The seeing part is distinguished in several ways.

10c

The verse says that beings' minds are composed of the union of the two parts. Whether the parts are internal or external, they are bound up with apprehending and being apprehended. The varieties of seeing include knowing or not knowing, either direct perception or inference. Here "seeing" refers to the seeing part of consciousness.

These four parts may be seen only as three, because the fourth part may be included in the third part. Or the four may be reduced to two, because the last three are all subjects with objects; that is, all three are the seeing part. "Seeing" means having

objects. Or they all may be reduced to one, because they are one in substance. A verse in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* says,

Mind, attached to itself,
Evolves resembling an external realm.
What is perceived by mind does not exist,
And therefore there is nothing but mind.

Thus in many places in the scriptures it is said that there is only the one mind. “One mind” also includes mental activities. Therefore the mode of activity of consciousness is perception, and perception is the seeing part of consciousness.

13. The Object of Perception

The word LOCATION|in the “Thirty Verses”| means that as a result of the maturation of its common seeds, the consciousness that is retribution transforms to resemble images of an external world, such as form, [sound,| etc.; that is, the external great elements and their derivatives. Although the worlds transformed by various beings are different for each, their characteristics are similar, so that there is no difference in the place |that they perceive|, just as the light of many assembled lamps seems to be the same light.

Whose consciousness as retribution transforms into these characteristics? One interpretation is that it is everyone’s consciousness. Why? A scripture says, “They arise all together through the overwhelming power of the action of living beings.” We refute this by saying that if this were so, then the consciousness of Buddhas and bodhisattvas would transform into this impure world, and the consciousness of ordinary beings would transform into the pure wonderful lands of this realm and elsewhere. Also, the holy ones, disgusted with the world of form and removed from it, born in the formless world and never departing it, would have consciousnesses that transform into this [impure] world, and what would be the point of that? Therefore it is the consciousnesses of beings born in this world, or who will be born into it, that transform into this apparent world. The scripture quoted above means only a part of

sentient beings when it mentions “all,” because, their karma being the same, the transformation of consciousness is common to all.

However, there is an objection. If this were so, then when the world receptacle is destroyed [at the end of the eon], and no one is left, nor anyone to be reborn in it, whose consciousness as retribution would transform into this realm? Also, beings who are disgusted with the realm of form and have left it to be reborn in the formless realm have immaterial bodies, so of what use would it be for them to evolve a world in advance of rebirth? If we concede [with the Mahāsāṃghikas] that there are distinctions of gross and subtle, etc., between those with immaterial bodies and different world receptacles, with no mutual support, then what would be the value of a consciousness in the formless realm transforming into one of these world receptacles? However, the world receptacle that evolves is basically the support of, and is for the use of, those material bodies, and therefore the world evolves in such a way that it can support and be used by those bodies. Consequently, we affirm that a consciousness born in a certain world can be born in the same kind of world elsewhere by transforming into that world. Thus a world receptacle about to be destroyed or about to appear, even without any sentient beings in it, can exist [because of the transformation of consciousness in another world]. With regard to this world being the support of, and being used by, beings in common, demons, celestials, and humans see the world differently and thus enjoy it differently, but you can understand this on the same principle as above. 11a

“Seeds” refers to all the impure seeds held by the consciousness that is retribution. They are included in the nature of this consciousness and are therefore its object of perception. Although pure seeds are connected with this consciousness, they are not included in its nature, and therefore they are not its perceptual object. Even though they are not its object of perception, they are not apart from it, just as ultimate reality is not, so this does not conflict with the principle of consciousness only.

“Body provided with organs” means that because of the power of the maturation of seeds in the consciousness that is retribution that are not common to all individuals, consciousness evolves into the material organs and the place [i.e., body] that supports the organs; in other words, the internal great elements and their derivatives. Because of the power of the maturation of common seeds, consciousness evolves into the apparent existence of other beings. If this were not so, one would not experience other people. There is an opinion that consciousness evolves into the apparent sense organs of others, because the *Madhyāntavibhāga* says that “it appears as the five sense organs of oneself and others.” However, there is another opinion: even though consciousness evolves as if it were a supporting body, the organs of someone else are of no use to oneself. The statement of the above treatise that “the five organs of oneself and others appear” means that oneself and others evolve the organs from their own individual consciousnesses. Therefore when one is reborn in another world or enters *nirvāṇa*, the surviving corpse is still visible to us.

The distinction of internal body, world receptacle, realms, and spiritual stages is the result of the evolution of consciousness through the power of karma. If world receptacle and body evolve through the power of *samādhi* and the like, then there is nothing definite causing realms, stages, self and others, etc. The body and world receptacle that evolve in most cases continue in an unbroken series, but light, sound, etc., that evolve from consciousness often last only a short time, because their appearance is the result of contemporary conditions.

This has been a brief discussion of the objects that evolve from consciousness; i.e., the impure seeds, the ten “material” sense bases (*rūpa-āyatana*), and the real form that falls into the category of the sense base for dharmas (*dharma-āyatana*).

Why does this consciousness not evolve as mind, mental activities, etc., and take them as objects? The transformation of defiled consciousness is of two kinds: transforming due to the power of causes and conditions, and transforming due to the power of imagination. The first transformation must have a function, and

the second is always an objective realm. The transformation of consciousness that is retribution always obeys causes and conditions, but the form, etc., that transform from it must have a real function. If consciousness transformed into mind [and its activities], they would have no real function, because, as the seen part of consciousness, they would have no perceptual objects. Indeed, the real function of mind, etc., is born from the eighth consciousness. Nor does this consciousness transform into unconditioned dharmas [such as space], which also has no real function. Therefore consciousness as retribution does not have mind and mental activities as objects. When this consciousness arrives at the stage of purity, it is associated with a superior wisdom, and although there is no discrimination, still, since it is pure, we say that it has no real function. Still, however, it manifests those images [of unconditioned dharmas, etc.]. If this were not the case, Buddhas would not be all-knowing.

Therefore in the stage of impurity, this consciousness as retribution takes as its object only the world receptacle and the body, as well as impure seeds. While in the realm of desire (*kāma-dhātu*) 11b or the realm of form (*rūpa-dhātu*), it still has these three perceptual objects. In the formless realm (*ārūpya-dhātu*), it has as an object only the impure seeds. Because one is separated from form in this realm, one has no form resulting from action, but one does have form resulting from meditation, which makes sense. The eighth consciousness has this form as its perceptual object.

The term IMPERCEPTIBLE [in Vasubandhu's verses] means that the mode of activity of this consciousness is extremely subtle and fine and therefore difficult to know thoroughly. Or, we may say that it is hard to know because the internal objects that it grasps and holds are extremely subtle, while the extent of the external world is hard to fathom. Why are the objects it grasps and the mode of activity of this consciousness difficult to know, [and how do we therefore know that it even exists]? Like consciousness that does not depart the body during the *samādhi* of cessation [of perception], it must be trusted to exist. You must admit that during this *samādhi* there is a consciousness, because the meditator is

still classified as a sentient being, just as when the mind is functioning in a normal way. It is the same even at the final stages of the cessation of thought [in *samādhi*].

14. Mental Activities Associated with the Store Consciousness

With how many mental activities is this [store] consciousness associated (*saṃprayukta*)? [Vasubandhu says, in the “Thirty Verses,”]

IT IS ALWAYS ASSOCIATED WITH MENTAL CONTACT,
ATTENTION, FEELING, CONCEPTUALIZATION, AND VOLITION.

From beginningless time up to the time of its final transformation, the *ālaya* consciousness in all its states is always associated with these five mental activities, because they are categorized as universal mental activities (*sarvatraga-caitta*).

A. Mental Contact

MENTAL CONTACT (*sparśa*) means the “union of the three,” “replica,” and “transformation,” and it causes contact between mind and its activities and their object. Its action is to serve as a support for feeling, conceptualization, volition, etc. The “union of the three” refers to the conformability of an organ, an object, and the resulting consciousness. Contact occurs in dependence on these three factors; it causes them to unite and is therefore called the “union of the three.” In a state of union, they conform to each other and have the power to generate mental activity, and this power is called “transformation.” Contact resembles the appearance of what is transformed and is therefore called its “replica” (*pariccheda*), because it is similar in power to the three transformed things.

The power of the transformation of the organ predominates in the arising of mental contact. Thus the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*, etc., merely say that it is the “replication of the transformation of the organ.” The nature of contact is to unite mind and its activities and cause them to come into contact together with the object. Being similar to the power [of the organ, etc.]

to conform and produce mental activity, its activity is to be the support of feeling, etc. The *Sutra of Birth and Extinction* says, “Contact is the condition for such aggregates as feeling, conceptualization, and volition.” This is why the scripture says that consciousness, contact, feeling, etc., are born as a result of the union of two, three, or four [factors, respectively]. As for the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* saying that it is the support of only feeling, conceptualization, and volition, this is because volition is the dominant factor in the aggregate of the karmic predispositions, and thus to mention it is to include the other karmic predispositions. The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* says that contact is the support of feeling, but this is because contact is the proximate and principal factor in the generation of feeling. That is, the characteristics of agreeableness, etc., grasped through contact are extremely close to the characteristics of advantageousness, etc., grasped by feeling, and for that reason, contact is the most important factor in arousing feeling. The nature of contact is real, not fictional, because it is a mental activity included among the traditional six hexads, because it is categorized as a form of nutriment, and because it is one of the conditions [among the twelve elements of conditioned arising (*pratītyasamutpāda*)], just as feeling, etc., are, so it is not simply [a conventional name for] the union of three elements. 11c

B. Attention

ATTENTION (*manaskāra*) has as its nature the arousing of mind, and its activity is that of directing mind to the objective realm. It arouses and awakens the seeds of the mind that will come into existence and leads this mind and makes it approach its object; hence, its name ATTENTION. Even though it is also able to direct and generate the mental activities, it is only said to direct mind, because mind is the principal factor. One explanation is that attention makes mind turn toward different objects. Another explanation is that it holds the mind fixed on a single object and therefore is called “attention.” Neither explanation is correct, because [in

the first case] it would no longer be omnipresent, and [in the second case] it would not differ from *samādhi*.

C. Feeling

FEELING (*vedanā*) has as its nature the experience of objects that are agreeable, disagreeable, or neither, and its activity is that of arousing craving because it creates a desire for union, separation, or neither one. There is an explanation [by Saṃghabhadra] that says that feeling is of two kinds: feeling objects, which means experiencing the object of perception, and the feeling of self-nature, which means experiencing simultaneous mental contact. Only the second kind is real feeling, because feeling the objective realm is shared by other characteristics [of consciousness]. This theory, however, is not reasonable, because feeling certainly does not have as its object the contact that is born with it. If you claim that it is called “experiencing contact” because it is similar to contact, then all results resembling their cause would be called “feeling nature.” Also, since feeling feels its cause, you ought to call it “feeling its cause,” not “feeling self-nature.” If you claim that feeling experiences the nature of the feeling born from contact in the same way that a ruler consumes his kingdom and is therefore called [feeling of] self-nature, your reasoning is faulty, because it goes against your own doctrine of the impossibility of self-authentication. If you call it the feeling of self-nature because it does not abandon its self-nature, then all dharmas would be called “feeling of self-nature.” Therefore this explanation of Saṃghabhadra only fools infants. However, the feeling of the objective realm is not shared by other mental activities, because the feeling of agreeableness, etc., which is unique to itself, is what we are calling “feeling the objective realm,” and this is not shared by other mental activities.

D. Conceptualization

The nature of CONCEPTUALIZATION (*saṃjñā*) is that of grasping images of objects, and its activity is that of displaying and producing

various names and words. When distinct characteristics [green, etc.,] of the object are established, then various names and words are produced accordingly.

E. Volition

The nature of VOLITION (*cetanā*) is that of making the mind work, and its activity is that of bending the mind toward good, etc. When it grasps the characteristics of an object as causes of good, etc., it urges the mind to create good, etc.

These five mental activities are categorized as being universal activities and are therefore definitely associated with the store consciousness. The characteristic of universality will be explained later at length. These five mental activities, contact, etc., although different from the mode of activity of this consciousness as retribution, are similar to it in terms of time of occurrence, support, object, etc., and for that reason are said to be associated.

The mode of activity of this consciousness is extremely inacute, 12a
unable to discriminate the character of objects as agreeable or disagreeable; it is subtle and fine, of a single species, and evolves in a continuous series; and for these reasons it is said [by Vasubandhu] that it is ONLY ASSOCIATED WITH THE FEELING OF INDIFFERENCE. The feeling associated with this consciousness is retribution only, because it evolves in accordance with karma projected from a previous existence, does not depend on present conditions, and evolves due to the power of good and bad action, so there is only the feeling of indifference. The two feelings of pain and pleasure are born as a result of retribution but are not themselves retribution, because they depend on present conditions and thus are not associated with this consciousness.

Since this consciousness is constant and always the same, sentient beings always grasp it as an inner self. If it were associated with the two feelings of pleasure and pain and thus changed, how could it be grasped as the [changeless] self? Therefore it is only associated with the feeling of indifference. But if this is so, how can this consciousness be retribution for karma? Since it is

admitted that good action can arouse feelings of indifference, bad action must be able to also. The feeling of indifference is not opposed to the classes of pain and pleasure, just as the indeterminate occurs along with good and bad.

Why is this consciousness not associated with mental activities with special objects, such as desire, etc.? Because these activities and this consciousness are opposed to each other. Desire arises from hope for something enjoyable, but this consciousness is unconcerned and hopes for nothing. Resolve comes from ascertainment of definite things, but this consciousness is dull and does not ascertain. Memory only occurs when one clearly remembers something known or practiced, but this consciousness is weak and dull and remembers nothing. Meditation is the ability to keep mind fixed on a single object, but this consciousness is unconcerned and has different objects of perception from instant to instant. Discernment occurs when there is an examination of such things as qualities, but this consciousness is subtle and dull and cannot examine. Therefore this consciousness is not associated with mental activities with special objects. Being nothing but retribution, it is not associated with such things as good, defilement, etc. As for the four indeterminate dharmas, such as shame, etc., these are intermittent and decidedly not retribution.

15. The Nature of the Eighth Consciousness

Dharmas are of four kinds: good, bad, indeterminate and veiled [i.e., defiled], and indeterminate and unveiled. In which kind is the *ālaya* consciousness included? It is only indeterminate and unveiled, because its nature is that of retribution. If retribution were good, soiled, etc., then rebirth in *samsāra* would not occur, nor would return [to *nirvāṇa*] and extinction occur. Also, because this consciousness is the support of good, defiled dharmas, if it were itself good or defiled, it and dharmas would be contradictory and it could not act as the support for these two dharmas. Also, because this consciousness is by nature perfumable, then, if it were good or defiled, like something with a very fragrant

odor, it could not take perfuming. If there were no perfuming, then impure or pure causes and results would not occur. Therefore this consciousness is morally indeterminate and unveiled only.

The term “veiled” refers to a soiled dharma, because it constitutes an obstacle [like a veil] to the holy path, and also because it obscures mind and prevents purification. This consciousness is not soiled, and so it is said to be unveiled. “Determinate” means either good or bad, because good and bad have desirable or undesirable results and consequently, being of exceptionally strong natures, can be determined [as one or the other]. This consciousness is neither good nor bad; therefore, it is called “indeterminate.”

16. The Nature of Mental Activities

[Vasubandhu’s verses continue,] AND THE SAME IS TRUE OF MENTAL CONTACT, ETC. This means that contact is like the eighth consciousness in being morally indeterminate and undefiled. Contact, attention, feeling, conceptualization, and volition are like it because associated dharmas must have the same moral nature. Or, the verse means that these five, such as contact, are like the *ālaya* consciousness in being retribution, in the way that their mode of activity and objects are unknowable, in having as object three kinds of things, in being associated with five dharmas, and in being morally indeterminate and undefiled.

12b

There is another interpretation [by Nanda] to the effect that the similarity of contact, etc., to the *ālaya* is that both are retribution and contain all the seeds, and are indeterminate and undefiled, etc., and thus the word SAME is unrestricted in its reference. This is unreasonable. Why? Because contact, etc., are supported by the eighth consciousness and are not independent. Like covetousness, faith, etc., are not perfumable, so how can they hold seeds in the way the eighth consciousness does? Also, if contact, etc., can be perfumed, would not sentient beings each have six kinds of substance? If that were the case, from what seeds would the results be born? Reason cannot allow that

results can come from six different seeds, because we never see a sprout born from six different seeds. If you claim that the result is produced from only one seed, then what is the use of the other five? Nor can it be said that seeds produce results in succession, because perfuming occurs simultaneously and has the same power, etc. Nor can you say that six results are born simultaneously, because no sentient being has six visual consciousnesses born at the same time in the space of an instant.

[Nanda replies,] I never said that contact, etc., can be perfumed and hold seeds. [Dharmapāla says,] if that is not so, then how can contact, etc., like the eighth consciousness, be called “possessing all seeds”? [Nanda replies,] I mean that contact, etc., can be called “possessing all seeds” in the sense that these five mental activities have characteristics similar to seeds. They have the same objects as consciousness, and contact in the formless realm has an object, and [since there is no form,] a proximate objective condition [in the form of seeds] must exist. These quasi-seeds are not the causes that engender actual consciousness, just as contact, etc., in the formless realm, like visual organs, etc., are not the support of consciousness. They are like the semblance of fire, which has no function of burning. [Dharmapāla replies,] that solution to your problem is unreasonable, because if contact, etc., have the images of quasi-seeds, etc., as objects, that which they grasp and their place will be mixed with the eighth consciousness [which Vasubandhu says alone holds seeds]. Consequently, the expression “all seeds” is to be taken as meaning that it takes perfuming and holds seeds. If that is not so, then Vasubandhu’s verse is guilty of needless repetition. Also [Nanda’s statement] that the words “the same” are not restrictive and lead to a mixture [of functions] is not proved. The five mental activities, such as contact, are incapable of discrimination, and what is more, contact, etc., would end up being associated activities of the same contact, etc. Consequently, we know that the expression “the same” means “in the appropriate cases,” not “in all cases.”

17. Evolving Like a Flowing Stream

Is the *ālaya* consciousness constant or discontinuous? It is neither constant nor discontinuous, because IT ALWAYS EVOLVES. ALWAYS means that from beginningless time, this consciousness has remained a homogeneous series, constant, without interruption, because it serves as the origin of the three realms, the five paths of rebirth, and the four forms of birth, and because its nature is that of firmly holding the seeds and preventing their loss. 12c

EVOLVES means that from beginningless time, this consciousness is born and perishes from instant to instant and changes from its former state to a subsequent state. The cause perishes and the result is born, and therefore it is never the same, and for that reason it can be perfumed by the other evolving consciousnesses and create new seeds.

The word ALWAYS denies cessation, while the word EVOLVES shows that it is not constant. The simile LIKE A FLOWING STREAM indicates the very nature of causation. Just as the water of a flowing river is neither constant nor discontinuous, and continues for a long time along with things that float in it or sink in it, so this consciousness, which since beginningless time is born and perishes in a continuous stream, is neither constant nor discontinuous, and carries with it floating and sinking sentient beings who cannot escape from it. Just as a flowing stream is not interrupted when a wind whips it into waves, so does this consciousness always continue on in a stream even though it encounters various conditions and generates visual consciousness and the like. Also, just as fish, plants, etc., float in the stream and follow it without being lost, so does this consciousness always follow its evolving course, carrying along its internal perfuming and external contact, etc. These similes show that this consciousness has been cause and effect from the beginning and is neither interrupted nor constant. That is, from beginningless time the nature of this consciousness is such that from instant to instant the result is born as the cause perishes. Because a result is born, there is no interruption; because

the cause perishes, there is no constancy. Its being neither discontinuous nor constant is the principle of conditioned arising. Therefore Vasubandhu says that this consciousness ALWAYS EVOLVES LIKE A FLOWING STREAM.

18. Incorrect Doctrines

[The Sarvāstivādins ask,] if [according to you] past and future do not really exist, you may still affirm nonpermanence, but how can you affirm noncessation? If there is only cessation, how can you conform to the correct principle of conditioned arising (*pratītya-samutpāda*)? [We reply,] if [according to you] past and future really exist, you can affirm nondiscontinuity, but how can you affirm nonconstancy? If there is only continuity, how can you conform to the correct principle of conditioned arising? [They reply,] how do you affirm your own interpretation by merely reviling ours? [We reply,] it is difficult to demonstrate the truth without first refuting the false. When the prior cause is in a state of cessation, the subsequent result is born, just as when one side of a scale sinks, the other side ascends. Thus cause and effect continue like a stream. Why argue a fictional past and future in order to avoid the error of cessation?

[The Sarvāstivādins object:] When the cause is actually present but the following result does not yet exist, of what is the cause a cause? When the result is present and the prior cause is extinct, of what is the result a result? If there are no causes or results, who avoids the errors of cessation and permanence? [We reply,] if the subsequent result already exists when the cause still exists, then since the result already exists on its own, what is the use for the prior cause? Since there is no meaning of cause, how can you hold to the notion of a result? If there are no causes or results, how can you avoid the errors of cessation and constancy?

[They reply,] our interpretation of cause and effect rests on the activity of dharmas, and therefore your objection does not compromise our teaching. [We reply,] if the substance [of a dharma] exists on its own in advance, then its activity must also, because the causes and conditions that are required also would

exist on their own in advance. Consequently, the cause and effect you advocate do not exist, and you should believe in the correct principle of conditioned arising as held by the Mahayana. The correct principle is profound, subtle, and difficult to articulate. Such words as “cause” and “effect” are all metaphorical designations. When we contemplate an actual dharma that will later attract a functioning [dharma], we metaphorically posit a future dharma and say, with respect to it, that there is a present cause. 13a When we contemplate a present dharma as corresponding to a former characteristic, we metaphorically posit a past cause and say with respect to it that there is a present result. “Metaphorically” means that present consciousness appears with the character of past and future. In this way, the principle of cause and effect is quite clear. It avoids the two extremes [of cessation and permanence] and conforms to the Middle Way. All wise people should follow this principle, practice it, and study it.

[The Sthaviras say that] although past and future do not exist, still, there are causes and effects that continue in a series. Though the present stream of dharmas is extremely rapid, still each dharma in the series has two phases of existence, a former state and a subsequent one, a period of birth and a period of extinction. When it is born, it repays its cause; when it perishes, it attracts a result. Although there are these two phases or times, the substance of the dharma is unitary. Just as the prior cause perishes, the subsequent result is born, and although substance and characteristics are distinct, both occur simultaneously. Thus cause and effect are not metaphors. However, there are no errors of cessation and permanence, nor any of the problems cited earlier. Who of the wise would reject this and believe the other?

[We reply,] your words are just vain chatter and meaningless. How can instantaneous dharmas exist in two times? The characteristics of birth and cessation are contradictory, so how can they coexist? If cessation is presently occurring, then birth must be in the future. “Existence” is called “birth,” since it is in the present, and “nonexistence” is called “cessation,” so it must be in the past.

If cessation is not nonexistence, then birth must be nonexistence, and since birth is present existence, cessation must be present nonexistence. Also, if the two characteristics are mutually contradictory, how can their substance be unitary? We do not see such things with contradictories such as pain and pleasure. If birth and cessation are one, they cannot occur in two different times. If birth and cessation are different, how can you claim that their substance is the same? Therefore the principle that birth and cessation are simultaneously in the present and have the same single substance as support is certainly not established.

The Sautrāntika principle of the continuity of cause and effect is also not established, because it does not admit the existence of the *ālaya* consciousness that holds the seeds. Consequently, you should believe in the correct principle of conditioned arising as the continuity of cause and effect as taught by the Mahayana.

19. Cessation of the Store Consciousness

From beginningless time, this consciousness has evolved like a stream. At what point is it utterly abandoned? IT IS ABANDONED IN THE STATE OF ARHATSHIP. Arhats are saints at the time when they terminate the obstacle of the passions (*kleśa-āvaraṇa*) utterly. They are said to ABANDON [*ālaya* consciousness] because at that time, the coarse and heavy class of passions is forever removed. The ARHAT refers to those of all three vehicles who have progressed beyond the stage of learning (*śaikṣa*); they are so called because they have slain the enemies who are the passions, because they are deserving of receiving the world's special veneration, and because never again will they experience birth [and death] by allotment [due to karma]. How do we know that this is so? Because some commentators, quoting the *Viniścayasamgraha*, say, "Arhats, *pratyekabuddhas*, and Tathāgatas are not provided with an *ālaya* consciousness." In the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* it says, "At the moment the bodhisattva attains *bodhi*, he suddenly cuts off the passions and the obstacle to that which is to be known and becomes an arhat and a Tathāgata."

But if this is so, the seeds of the passions are still not utterly destroyed, and therefore they are not arhats. They must be provided with *ālaya* consciousness. But, [it is asked,] why does the *Viniścaya-saṃgraha* say that the nonregressing bodhisattva is not provided with an *ālaya* consciousness? Because it says that those who have progressed beyond learning in the two [non-Mahayana] vehicles have a change of heart and turn toward great awakening; and because they do so they never regress or arouse the obstacle of passions. That is, they are called “nonregressing bodhisattvas” and are not provided with *ālaya* consciousnesses. They are categorized as arhats, so these passages do not contradict our interpretation. 13b

Also, [according to Dharmapāla,] in bodhisattvas from the [eighth] stage [of bodhisattvas, named] “Immovable” on, the passions are never again active, [hence they are said to be nonregressing]. They are also called “nonregressing bodhisattvas” because they proceed effortlessly in the rapid stream of the Dharma, they are able to engender practice among all activities, and they evolve and progress from instant to instant. However, even though these bodhisattvas have not utterly terminated the seeds of the passions in the consciousness as retribution, when they are aware of their own consciousnesses, the view of self and self-love, etc., never again grasp the store consciousness as an inner self. As a consequence, this consciousness loses the name of *ālaya* for good, and therefore it is said that these bodhisattvas are not provided with *ālaya* consciousnesses. These bodhisattvas are what is meant by “arhats.”

There is another interpretation [by Nanda] that says that from the very first stage on, the bodhisattva has realized the principle revealed by the two-fold emptiness [and is therefore said to be nonregressing]. He is also called that because he has acquired the two kinds of superior knowledge, he has eliminated the two heavy obstacles of discrimination, and he arouses various practices within a single activity. Even though he produces various passions in order to benefit [other beings], there are no transgressions involved in these passions, and for that reason he is called a “nonregressing

bodhisattva.” Even though the bodhisattva has not eliminated innate passions utterly, when he recognizes his own consciousness, the view of self and self-love never again grasps this consciousness as an inner self. Consequently, it loses the name *ālaya*, and it is said that he is not provided with *ālaya* consciousness and that he is an arhat.

Therefore the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* says that even though the bodhisattva in the ten stages (*bhūmi*) has not forever exterminated all the passions, these passions are like poison that has been subdued by mantras and medicines, and so they do not give rise to transgressions associated with passions. He is called an arhat because in all stages of the bodhisattva he is like an arhat who has totally exterminated the passions.

[The two former masters reply to Nanda,] this explanation is unreasonable. In the first seven bodhisattva stages, there remain innate views of self and self-love that grasp the store consciousness as an inner self, so how can that consciousness lose its name of *ālaya*?

[Nanda replies,] it can be said that the name of *ālaya* is lost if the views of self and self-love arising from discrimination never again attach to the store consciousness. [We reply that] in that case, the name must be abandoned in connection with stream-winners (*srota-āpanna*), etc., who are still in the learning stage, and if you agree with that, it contradicts all the treatises. [Nanda replies,] passions in the bodhisattva in the ten stages are the result of true wisdom, so they are not transgressions. Stream-winners and the like cannot have passions of this kind, so how can they be compared with bodhisattvas? [We reply,] even though passions generated in the sixth consciousness are the result of true wisdom and are not transgressions, still the seventh consciousness in its state of impurity spontaneously acts and grasps the store consciousness [as a self], so how are these bodhisattvas not like stream-winners? Consequently, we know that [Nanda’s] interpretation is not correct.

Now, because the arhat totally and completely eliminates the gross and heavy class of passions in this [seventh] consciousness, he never again grasps the *ālaya* consciousness as an inner self. Consequently, this consciousness forever loses the name of *ālaya*,

13c

which is said to be ABANDONED [in Vasubandhu's verses]. The arhat does not abandon the whole substance of the eighth consciousness, for it must not be that at the moment when he is without a consciousness holding the seeds he enters *nirvāṇa* without remainder (*nirupadhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa*).

20. Names and Types of the Eighth Consciousness

Even though all sentient beings are provided with an eighth consciousness, it has different names in accordance with the meaning. It may be called "mind" (*citta*) because it accumulates seeds perfumed by various dharmas. It may be called *ādāna*, or "maintaining" consciousness, because it holds the seeds and material organs and prevents their destruction. It may be called "support of the knowable" (*jñeya-āśraya*), because it is the support of dharmas that are known, whether impure or pure. It may be called "seed consciousness" (*bīja-vijñāna*), because it universally holds mundane and supramundane seeds. These names are suitable to all states [of spiritual development].

It is also called *ālaya*, because it stores all defiled dharmas and prevents their loss, and because views of self, self-love, etc., grasp the store as an inner self. This name, however, applies only to ordinary beings and learners, because those beyond the learning stage, and nonregressing bodhisattvas, are not attached to impure dharmas. It is also called "consciousness as retribution" (*vipāka-vijñāna*), because it is the result, in the form of retribution, of good and bad action that attracts the cycle of death and rebirth. This name applies only to ordinary beings, two-vehicle saints, and bodhisattvas, because at the stage of a Tathāgata there are no indeterminate dharmas in the form of retribution. Finally, it is called "immaculate consciousness" (*amala-vijñāna*), which is extremely pure, because it is the support of all unsoiled dharmas. This name only applies to consciousness in the stage of a Tathāgata, because among bodhisattvas, [saints of] the two vehicles, and ordinary people, consciousness holds seeds and can be perfumed, and these people have not yet acquired an eighth consciousness that is

purified, etc. As a scripture says, “The immaculate consciousness of a Tathāgata is the realm of purity and nondefilement, free of all obstacles, and corresponding to perfect mirror knowledge.”

The name *ālaya* is extensively discussed in this treatise because its transgressions are serious and because it is the first to be abandoned. The substance of consciousness as retribution is abandoned by bodhisattvas as they are about to attain awakening and by disciples and *pratyekabuddhas* at the time they enter *nirvāṇa* without remainder. At no time is immaculate consciousness abandoned, because there is no time when there is an end to benefitting beings and making them happy. Terms such as “mind,” etc., apply generally to all states and should be used depending on the context.

14a However, generally speaking, the eighth consciousness exists in two states. The first is its impure state, which is indeterminate, associated only with five dharmas, such as contact, and has as an object the aforementioned things it grasps and holds (*upādi*), location (*sthāna*), etc. The second is its pure state. Its nature is only good. It is associated with twenty-one mental activities: five universal activities, five activities with special objects, and eleven good activities. This is because the universal activities are always associated with all minds, and [regarding activities with special objects,] it is [always associated with desire] because it desires to experience and know what is perceived; [resolve,] because it always ascertains an object that is being contemplated; [memory,] because it always clearly records what has been previously experienced; [*samādhi*,] because the World-Honored Ones are never without unified minds; and [discernment,] because it always clearly discerns all dharmas. It is associated with eleven good mental activities because pure consciousness is always associated with pure faith, etc., because it is lacking in impurity, and because it is undistracted and unmoved. It is also associated with the feeling of indifference, because it spontaneously evolves evenly at all times. It has as its object all the dharmas, because perfect mirror knowledge universally has all dharmas as its object.

21. Proof of the Existence of the Eighth Consciousness

How do we know that apart from visual consciousness, etc., the eighth consciousness has a separate, independent substance? Through holy teaching and proper reasoning. It says in the *Mahāyāna-abhidharma Sūtra*, “From beginningless time, there has existed an element (*dhātu*) that is the support of all dharmas, etc. From it come all the paths of existence and the attainment of *nirvāṇa*.”

A. First Explanation

The eighth consciousness is very subtle by nature and is manifested only through its activity. The first half of the above passage shows that the eighth consciousness functions as cause and condition; the second half shows it functioning as the support of flowing and evolving [in *saṃsāra*] and returning [to *nirvāṇa*] and cessation. “Element” means “cause”; that is, from beginningless time, the seed consciousness has evolved in a continuous series [of causes and effects], producing all the dharmas spontaneously, and for that reason it is called a “cause.”

The word “support” means “condition.” As the “maintaining” consciousness, it has been the support of all dharmas since beginningless time, and for this reason it is their condition. That is, it is a support because it maintains the seeds, it is the support of actual, active dharmas, and it transforms into them. “Transforms into them” means that it transforms into a world receptacle and a body provided with organs. “Is their support” means that it acts as a support for the other evolving consciousnesses. That is, it holds and maintains the five material organs, and therefore the five kinds of consciousness—visual, etc.—evolve supported by it. And, because it is the support of *manas*, the sixth consciousness, *manas* consciousness also evolves supported by it. Because *manas* and *manas* consciousness are forms of evolving consciousness, they must, like visual consciousness, etc., be supported by organs existing simultaneously with them. The eighth consciousness, being a form of consciousness by nature, must also have a

simultaneous support in the *manas*, or seventh, consciousness. This means that the function of this consciousness is that of being a cause.

14b The expression “from it” in the verse means “from this consciousness.” “Come all the paths of existence” means “come good and bad paths of existence.” This means that the eighth consciousness is responsible for holding all the dharmas conforming to transmigration in *saṃsāra* and causes beings to transmigrate in *saṃsāra*. Even though delusion, karma, and forms of birth are all transmigration, the verse only refers to “paths of existence,” because they are the principal part of the result. Or the words “paths of existence” refer to both the places where one wanders in transmigration and to those things that cause one to transmigrate. Those things that accompany and assist the paths [such as the receptacle world] can also be called “paths of existence.” Delusion, karma, and forms of birth are supported by this consciousness that acts as a support for transmigration.

The phrase “and the attainment of *nirvāṇa*” means that as a result of this consciousness, there is the attainment of *nirvāṇa*. This means that an eighth consciousness exists that holds all the dharmas favorable to return and cessation, and that causes the cultivator of the path to attain *nirvāṇa*. The passage says only that one can experience and acquire the path, because *nirvāṇa* does not exist dependent on this consciousness. Or it may speak only of the *nirvāṇa* that is to be realized, because it is what the cultivator of the path really seeks. Or it may speak of both *nirvāṇa* and the path to it, because both are in the category of returning and cessation. In other words, the word “*nirvāṇa*” indicates the cessation that is realized, and the following “attains” refers to the path that attains. As a result of the path that cuts off, one cuts off delusions that are to be cut off, and at the ultimate, final stage, one fully attains *nirvāṇa*. That which cuts off, that which is cut off, and the realization all depend on this [eighth] consciousness, which performs the function of supporting the returning and cessation.

B. Second Explanation

Also, the first quarter (*pada*) of the above verse shows that the self-nature of this consciousness is beginningless and always existent, while the last three quarters of the verse indicate, generally and specifically, that this consciousness is the support of both impure and pure dharmas. "Impure dharmas" means the truths of suffering and the origination of suffering [in the four noble truths]; i.e., the paths of existence and that which leads one into the paths, or, alternately, birth, and karma and delusion. "Pure dharmas" means the truth of cessation and the path to cessation; i.e., that which is realized and that which realizes, or *nirvāṇa* and the path to it. Both dharmas exist in dependence on this consciousness, because it makes no sense to think that they are supported by the other [seven] evolving consciousnesses.

C. Third Explanation

The first quarter of the verse indicates the substance of this consciousness as being beginningless and continuous, while the last three quarters of the verse indicate that it is the support of the "three natures" (*trisvabhāva*). These are the dependent on others (*paratantra-svabhāva*), the falsely imagined (*parikalpita-svabhāva*), and the perfected (*pariṇiṣpanna-svabhāva*), in that order.

Now nothing mentioned in this verse can be found apart from the eighth consciousness. The *Abhidharma Sūtra* says, "The consciousness that contains all the seeds is called *ālaya*, because it embraces and stores all dharmas. I have revealed it to the superior ones." That is, since this fundamental consciousness contains the seeds, it embraces and stores all impure dharmas. The name *ālaya* comes from this. It is not like the superior nature [of the Sāṃkhyas] evolving into *Mahat*, etc., because the seeds are not identical with the substance of the result [i.e., fundamental consciousness]. The reason for this is that the support and that which is supported are born and perish together. It is also called *ālaya* because impure dharmas and it embrace and harbor each other, and sentient beings grasp it as a self.

The hosts of bodhisattvas who have entered the path of insight and obtained actual contemplation of reality (*tattva-abhisamaya*) are called “superior ones” [in the verse]. They have the ability to realize and comprehend the *ālaya* consciousness, and for that reason our World-Honored One properly revealed it.

On the other hand, all bodhisattvas are called “superior ones.” Even though prior to the path of insight they are unable to realize and comprehend the *ālaya* consciousness, they are still capable of believing in, understanding, and seeking the transmutation of the support, and the Buddha was also referring to them. Other evolving consciousnesses do not have this meaning.

In the *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra*, the Buddha says, “The *ādāna* consciousness is deep and subtle, and all the seeds [in it] resemble a flowing stream. I do not teach it to ordinary people or fools, fearing they will discriminate and grasp it as a self.” This consciousness is called *ādāna* (“maintaining”) because it grasps and holds the seeds of dharmas, it grasps and holds the support that is material organs, and it grasps and holds the bond to rebirth and the continuity [of cause and effect]. It therefore says that this consciousness is called *ādāna*. Beings without hope of *nirvāṇa* (*agotraka*) cannot glimpse its depths, and therefore it is said to be “extremely deep.” Members of the family of those who seek rest [in *nirvāṇa*] are unable to grasp it, and therefore it is said to be “extremely subtle.” It is the real seed of all dharmas. Moved by conditions, it produces the “waves” of the various evolving consciousnesses, but it continues on without interruption, like a flowing stream.

“Ordinary people” are those who belong to the family of those not destined to be awakened, and “fools” refers to those who seek rest. Fearful that they will discriminate and grasp it, fall into evil paths of existence, or encounter obstacles to the holy paths, our World-Honored One does not teach it to them. Only the eighth consciousness has these characteristics.

In the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*, the Buddha says, “Just as the ocean encounters the condition of wind and produces many waves but rolls on uninterrupted just as it is, so is it that the ocean of the store consciousness, battered by the wind of objects and perpetually

producing the waves of various forms of consciousness, rolls on without interruption just as it is." Visual consciousness, etc., is unlike a great ocean that always flows on in a stream while producing waves, and therefore we know that there is a separate eighth consciousness.

In these various Mahayana scriptures, it is said that this eighth consciousness exists. All Mahayana scriptures conform to the teaching of no self and contradict the notion of persons. They reject transmigration in *samsāra* and turn toward returning [to *nirvāṇa*] and cessation, they praise the Buddha, his Teaching, and Community of followers and condemn non-Buddhist [methods], and they teach the aggregates (*skandhas*) and deny [the existence of] originating beings. Those that adhere to the Mahayana affirm that these texts are among those that reveal the truth without distortion, and thus these are included as orthodox in the *āgamas*, like the *Ekottarāgama*, etc.

Also, Ārya Maitreya demonstrates that the Mahayana scriptures are really the teachings of the Buddha by means of seven reasons:

1. Not predicted at the beginning. If Mahayana scriptures were preached by someone else after the Buddha's *nirvāṇa* in order to destroy the True Dharma, why did the World-Honored One not predict it, as he predicted other calamities?

2. Mahayana and Hinayana have been active together from the beginning. The teachings of the two vehicles have occurred together from the beginning, so how does one know that just the Great Vehicle alone is not the word of the Buddha?

3. Mahayana teachings are not accessible to others. The teachings of the Mahayana are vast and extremely profound, are not the domain of speculation by non-Buddhists, etc., and they have not been taught in their scriptures; and even if they were taught, they are not believed. Therefore, it is false that Mahayana scriptures are not the words of the Buddha.

15a

4. Mahayana teachings are totally established. If you claim that the Mahayana is the teaching of other Buddhas but not of the present Buddha, the principle that Mahayana teachings were taught by a Buddha is totally established.

5. Consequences of the existence or nonexistence of the Mahayana. If there is a Mahayana, then we must trust that these Mahayana teachings came from the Buddha, because no Mahayana can be found apart from them. If there is no Mahayana, then the teachings of the disciples must not exist either, because without the Mahayana, no one would become a Buddha. In that case, who would appear in the world to teach the vehicle of the disciples? Therefore that the vehicle of the disciples was taught by the Buddha but that the teachings of the Mahayana were not is not proper reasoning.

6. It is an antidote. Practitioners who make an effort based on Mahayana scriptures are able to obtain the nondiscriminatory insight that serves as an antidote to all the passions, and therefore they must be the teachings of the Buddha.

7. The meaning is different from the letter. The purport of the Mahayana teachings is extremely profound. The meaning cannot be construed simply by going by the letter of the text and then slandering it and denying its genuineness. Therefore the Mahayana is truly the teaching of the Buddha. As a verse in the *Sūtrālaṃkāra* says, |“The Mahayana is the word of the Buddha| because of lack of prediction, simultaneous occurrence, not being accessible to others, total establishment, consequences of the existence or nonexistence [of Mahayana], being an antidote, and differing from the literal meaning.”

Scriptures of other Buddhist schools also teach the existence of an *ālaya* consciousness that has a distinct self-nature, but they use a hidden meaning. For instance, the *āgama* of the Mahā-sāṃghikas teaches this consciousness, using a hidden meaning, and calls it “root consciousness” (*mūla-vijñāna*). It is the support of visual and other forms of consciousness in the same way that the roots of a tree are the foundation for branches, etc. Visual consciousness does not function in this way.

Scriptures of both the Sthaviras and the Vibhajyavādins, using a hidden meaning, call this consciousness *bhavāṅga* (*bhava* + *āṅga*) consciousness. *Bhava* means “existence,” referring to the three realms of existence. *Āṅga* means “cause,” and only this

consciousness, being permanent and everywhere [including the formless realm, in which visual consciousness does not exist], can be a cause for the three realms of existence.

The Mahiśāsakas call this consciousness the “aggregate that lasts up to the end of *saṃsāra*.” Apart from this consciousness, there is no other aggregate or dharma that persists without interruption up to the end of *saṃsāra*. In the formless realm, form is disrupted, and among the unconscious celestials (*asaṃjñika-deva*), etc., other forms of consciousness are extinct, and we have already exhaustively established that apart from form, mind, etc., the associated mental activities have no distinct substances of their own; and therefore this [*ālaya* consciousness] is what is meant by the “aggregate that lasts up to the end of *saṃsāra*.”

The Sarvāstivādins also, using a hidden meaning, speak of this consciousness as an *ālaya*. The *Ekottarāgama* speaks of “love of *ālaya*, pleasure in *ālaya*, joy in *ālaya*, and delight in *ālaya*.” That is, the *ālaya* consciousness is the object, generally and specifically, of desire during the past, future, and present. Sentient beings grasp it as a real inner self, and it continues to generate sensual attachment up to the point when it is eliminated. Therefore the *ālaya* is the real basis of sensual attachment. Beings are not attached to the other five aggregates that are grasped [as self]. When they are born in circumstances exclusively painful, they do not become attached to the other five aggregates that are grasped, but only hate them, thinking, “When will I be rid of this life, this that is common to all bodies, this suffering body and mind, and be allowed to be free and happy?”

15b

Nor are the objects of the five kinds of consciousness the real basis of sensual attachment, because even though those who are free of desire do not desire or grasp after the five wonderful objects of desire, they still love the self. Likewise, pleasant feelings are not the real basis of sensual attachment, because even though those who are detached from the impurities of the third trance state (*dhyāna*) are disgusted with pleasure, they still love the self. Nor is the view of real selfhood the real basis of sensual

attachment, because even though those who are not yet beyond the stage of learning believe that there is no self, and do not arouse any desire or love for the belief in a self, they nevertheless still arouse love for an inner self. Nor are the [other] evolving consciousnesses the real basis of sensual attachment, because even though those who are not yet post-learners and seeking the cessation of mind are disgusted with the other evolving consciousnesses, etc., they still love the self. Nor is the material body the real basis of sensual attachment, because even though those who are detached from the impurity of form are disgusted with the material body, they still love the self. Unassociated dharmas (*viprayukta-saṃskāra*) have no distinct substance apart from form, mind, etc., and therefore cannot be the real basis of sensual attachment.

When ordinary people and those still learning [the Way] arouse self-love, whether they love the other aggregates or not, they still generate a self-love with this [*ālaya*] consciousness as its object, and therefore only this consciousness is the real basis of sensual attachment. Consequently, when the *Ekottarāgama* speaks of an *ālaya*, it is indicating this, and only this, *ālaya* consciousness.

We have quoted the holy scriptures and now shall resort to correct reasoning. A scripture says, “It is that which has accumulated and created the seeds of impure and pure dharmas, and for that reason it is called *citta* [“mind,” from the Sanskrit root *ci*, meaning “to accumulate”], because without this consciousness there is no mind to hold the seeds.”

22. A Sautrāntika Position

[In opposition to the Sautrāntikas, who believe that the first six forms of consciousness contain the seeds, we reply that] those evolving consciousnesses are disrupted in the *samādhi* of cessation (*nirodha-samāpatti*); they are born from sense organs, objects, [different acts of] attention, and vary as to moral species; and they easily dissipate, and being fleeting, like flashes of lightning, they do not endure. Therefore, they cannot be perfumed, they cannot

hold seeds, and they are not the mind that accumulates impure and pure seeds.

The eighth consciousness is a single species and is not interrupted, like the sesame seed that endures and can be perfumed, and therefore corresponds to the mind spoken of in the scriptures. If you do not admit the existence of a mind that can hold seeds, you not only contradict the scriptures, you also violate correct reasoning. Active dharmas of the classes “pure” and “impure” could not perfume and create seeds [in the absence of a consciousness that is perfumable], and if that were the case, the existing dharmas would quickly lose their power. Also, if presently existing pure and impure dharmas are born without seeds as cause, this would result in the spontaneous generation held by non-Buddhists. 15c

Form and other dharmas not associated with mind, like sound and light, etc., are not mind, and in principle are not perfumed by internal pure and impure dharmas, so how can they hold seeds? Also, they have no self-existence apart from consciousness itself, so how can they be considered to be the support of internal seeds? [In conclusion, then,] the evolving consciousnesses and their associated mental activities are interrupted as consciousness [in the meditative states of cessation], easily appear and disappear, are not independent [of form and mind], are not of the nature of mind, cannot hold seeds, and do not accept perfuming. Therefore reason demands that some other mind must exist that holds seeds.

23. A Divergent Sautrāntika Position

Another [Sautrāntika] theory is that although the first six forms of consciousness have changed from state to state since beginningless time due to the organs and their objects, they remain unchanged as the species (*jāti*) [consciousness] and are therefore perfumable and can hold seeds [since they remain unchanged as the species “consciousness”]. As a result, impure and pure causes and effects are created, so what need is there for insisting on an eighth consciousness?

[We reply,] your position makes no sense. Why? If your species (*jāti*) is real, this is the same as what non-Buddhists teach. If you admit that the species is a fiction, then it has no particular function and must not have the ability to hold real seeds of internal dharmas. Also, in what category is your species, consciousness, included? If you categorize it as good or bad, it is unable to take perfuming, because you admit that it is determinate, like the cessation resulting from discrimination (*pratisaṃkhyā-nirodha*, which, being good by nature, cannot be perfumed). If it is indeterminate, then when mind is either good or bad, there will be no nondetermined mind, and the species will be interrupted. If the actual mind is good or bad, the species cannot be indeterminate, because the particular species must be the same as the particular thing itself.

Also, this species definitely does not exist in the mindless states [of *samādhi*], and since there is an interruption its nature is not firm and stable, so how can it be maintained that it holds seeds and takes perfuming? Moreover, since the minds of arhats and ordinary people would be of the same species, they would be perfumed by soiled and pure dharmas. To agree with this is a mistake. Finally, organs such as the eye, etc., would be of the same species as other dharmas, such as visual consciousness, and other organs, and would therefore perfume each other. You will not admit this, and so you should not hold the opinion that the species “consciousness” takes perfuming.

24. A Dārṣṭāntika Opinion

Also, since two successive moments of the [first] six consciousnesses, whether as a species or as individuals, are not simultaneous, like two separate moments, they do not perfume each other, because the perfumer and the perfumed must be simultaneous.

25. The Mahāsāṃghikas

As for the Mahāsāṃghika opinion that the [first] six consciousnesses evolve simultaneously, [we reply that] they are not perfumable, for reasons given earlier, and therefore they also do not qualify as being able to hold seeds.

26. The Sthaviras

There is an opinion that prior form or mind becomes subsequent seeds of their own species without interruption, thus establishing the principle of cause and effect. Therefore the previously mentioned [eighth consciousness] is not established. This opinion is unreasonable, because it does not involve perfuming. Since the species of those [form and mind] are not perfumed, how can you maintain that the former becomes the seed of the latter? Also, if there is an interruption, [the dharma] is not born again. Those of the two vehicles who have progressed beyond the learning stage will have no final aggregates, because form and mind at the point of death become seeds for afterwards [when they cease in *nirvāṇa*]. You must not say that form and mind alternate as seeds for each other, because, as previously mentioned, the evolving consciousnesses and form are not perfumable.

16a

27. The Sarvāstivādins

There is also an opinion that the dharmas of the three times [past, etc.] exist, so that cause and effect move forward with no difficulty, so what is the point of holding the opinion that there is a consciousness that holds seeds? When a scripture says that mind is a seed, it means that it generates impure and pure dharmas and its energy is powerful.

This is not reasonable, because past and future are neither eternal nor present, and, like [imaginary] flowers in the sky, they do not really exist. Also, they have no function, because they cannot be held to possess the nature of causality. If there is no consciousness that holds impure and pure seeds, none of the causes and effects are established.

28. Bhāvaviveka

There is an opinion that the Mahayana doctrine of emptiness as the denial of characteristics is absolute. Based on faulty inference, [Bhāvaviveka] denies the existence of this consciousness as well

as all dharmas. He is in strong contradiction with the above-quoted scripture. To hold as unreal knowledge [of suffering], extinction [of its cause], realization [of *nirvāṇa*], and practice [of the path], as well as defiled and pure causes and results, is to hold a terribly false view, because the non-Buddhists, slandering [the principle of] defiled and pure causes and results, also do not claim that [defiled and pure dharmas] are utterly nonexistent but only unreal.

If none of the dharmas really exists, bodhisattvas would not energetically cultivate and accumulate the equipment for *bodhi* in order to abandon *saṃsāra*. What wise person would seek out the sons of a stone woman to use as an army in order to repel phantom armies? Therefore you must believe that there is a mind that holds seeds and that defiled and pure causes and results are based on it. That mind is the eighth consciousness.

29. Mind as Retribution

A scripture speaks of a mind that is retribution, influenced by good and bad karma. If this consciousness does not exist, mind as retribution must not exist. That is because visual consciousness, etc., is interrupted, and because it is not always the result of karma, then, being like a lightning flash, it is not mind as retribution. This is because [dharmas that are] retribution do not continue in a series after stopping. The “life principle,” etc., are not like this. The six consciousnesses, such as the visual consciousness, that are agitated by karma, resemble sounds, etc., because they are not constant or continuous, and they are born of retribution, not retribution per se.

It must be granted that there is a real mind as retribution that repays projected karma, that is found in the three realms, is not interrupted, that changes into the body and world receptacle, and acts as a support for sentient beings. [We argue this] because (1) apart from mind, body and world receptacle are in fact nonexistent; (2) dharmas not associated with mind have no real substance; and (3) the evolving consciousnesses, etc., do not always exist. Without this consciousness, what changes into a body and

world receptacle? Based on what dharmas can sentience be always established [in *samādhī*, etc.]?

Also, in states of *samādhī*, or not in those states, whether or not there is discriminative thought, there is, in fact, much physical feeling. Without it, the individual later would [upon leaving *samādhī*] not experience well-being or fatigue. If a real mind as retribution does not always exist, how can these physical sensations exist in that state? When non-Buddhists generate other thoughts that are good, etc., they must be actually generating a real mind as retribution, just as it is admitted that they generate them at other times, because they are not Buddhas but sentient beings. Consequently, there is always a real mind as retribution, and it is the eighth consciousness. 16b

30. Paths of Rebirth and Forms of Birth

A scripture teaches that sentient beings transmigrate in five paths of rebirth (*gati*) and four forms of birth (*yonī*), because if this consciousness did not exist, the substance of those paths and forms of rebirth would not exist. The paths and forms of rebirth must exist and be perpetual, universal, and unmixed. Dharmas such as these can be established as truly real paths and forms of rebirth. With dharmas that are not retribution, paths and forms of rebirth would be confused, because, while abiding here [in one place], one would produce dharmas of other paths and forms of rebirth. Form as retribution, along with that which responds to action among the five forms of consciousness, do not constitute a universal [basis of] paths and forms of rebirth, because they do not exist in the formless realm. Good [dharmas] that are innate or responding to actions in the [sixth] thought consciousness, although constituting a universal [basis for] the paths and forms of rebirth, and being unmixed, do not always exist. Dharmas unassociated with mind have no real, independent substance and cannot be said to constitute a real [basis for] the paths and forms of rebirth.

Only mind as retribution and its mental activities are real, constant, universal, and unmixed and thus the real [basis for the]

paths and forms of rebirth. Without this mind, one born in the formless realm and generating [a thought that is] good, etc., would not have a path or form of rebirth. If it is admitted that the paths and forms of rebirth comprise all impurities, then one born in the formless realm and generating an impure mind would not have a path or form of birth, and this contradicts reason. We must avoid both the former and the present errors; therefore only the dharma of retribution is the real [basis for the] paths and forms of rebirth. Therefore the Tathāgata is not included in the paths or forms of rebirth, because a Buddha has no indeterminate dharmas as retribution. Nor is he included in the [three] realms, because he has no impurity, because the World-Honored One has abandoned the truths of suffering and its cause, and because he has cut off the seeds of idle discourse (*prapañca-bīja*). Since the [real basis for] paths of rebirth and forms of birth is mind as retribution and its activities, that mind and its activities cannot be established apart from the eighth consciousness, and therefore we know that there is a separate eighth consciousness.

31. Theory of Appropriation

A scripture says that the body provided with organs is “appropriated” [i.e., grasped and held]. If this consciousness did not exist, no appropriator would exist either. That is, only in the present, the five material sense organs and their support are appropriated; this must be the result of a mind that can appropriate them. Even though mind as retribution is attracted by former karma, it is neither good nor bad, it is omnipresent [throughout the three realms], it is of a single species, it is a continuous series, and it appropriates a body provided with organs. The evolving consciousnesses such as visual consciousness do not have these characteristics.

This statement means that the evolving consciousnesses such as visual consciousness are not omnipresent, are not a single species, are not a continuous series, and do not appropriate their own internal body provided with organs. It does not mean that the

appropriator is nothing but mind as retribution, because it must not be that the material bodies of Buddhas are not appropriated. Impure material bodies are appropriated only by the mind as retribution, hence the statement in the scripture. This means that the evolving consciousnesses appear as a result of present conditions, like sound, wind, etc., and because when they are good, bad, etc., they are not created by karma, like the cessation resulting from the absence of conditions. Because they are born of retribution and not retribution per se, are not universal supports, and do not continue in a series, like lightning flashes, etc., they cannot appropriate an impure material body. 16c

The words “mind” and “consciousness” include mental activities, because they are definitely associated with the mind, just as the words “consciousness only” [include mental activities]. The material organs and dharmas unassociated with mind cannot appropriate a body provided with organs, because, like space, etc., they have no objects. Therefore there must be a separate mind that appropriates, and it is the eighth consciousness.

32. Life, Heat, and Consciousness

A scripture says that life, heat, and consciousness persist in a series through mutual support. Without this [eighth] consciousness, there would be no consciousness that could hold life and heat and cause them to be always present. The evolving consciousnesses are discontinuous, like sound, wind, etc., and do not have the function of perpetually supporting, so they cannot be established as the consciousness that supports life and heat. Consciousness as retribution alone is uninterrupted and unevolving, and, like life and heat, it supports perpetually, so that it can be established as the consciousness that supports life and heat.

The scripture says that the three dharmas [life, etc.] support each other and that life and heat are a homogeneous series. Is it reasonable to think that consciousness alone is not so? [It is objected,] although the scripture says that the three dharmas support each other, it also admits that only heat is not found throughout

the three realms, so why not admit that consciousness by itself evolves intermittently [when heat is absent]? [We reply,] your point does not contradict our former point. Whenever these three dharmas are present and continuous, they support each other constantly. Otherwise, they do not have the function of perpetually supporting each other.

The term “consciousness” that was used to make a logical point earlier as one of the three dharmas does not refer to the evolving consciousnesses, so how does bringing up the matter of heat as nonuniversal conflict with our principles? Our former point is completely proven.

Moreover, since life and heat among these three dharmas is only impure, we also know that consciousness, like them, is definitely not pure. When one is born in the formless realm and produces a pure mind, what consciousness supports that life? Consequently, we know that there is a consciousness as retribution that is a single species, is perpetual and universal, and can support life and heat, and that is the eighth consciousness.

33. Mind at Birth and Death

A scripture says that at birth and death, all kinds of beings are mentally distracted and not in the mindless *samādhi*. If this [eighth] consciousness did not exist, mind would not exist at the moment of birth or death. At the time of birth or death, body and mind are confused and dull, as they are in a dreamless sleep or deep faint, and the sharply perceiving evolving consciousnesses do not operate. In these states, the mode of activity and objects of these six forms of consciousness cannot be known, and therefore these consciousnesses, as in the mindless state [of *samādhi*], are not actually present. The existence of the activities and objects of the sixfold evolving consciousnesses must be knowable, just as they are at other times. Because the real consciousness as retribution is extremely fine and subtle, its mode of activity and objects cannot be discerned. It is the result of karma that leads [to rebirth] and for a time continues in a series, is perpetual, and

17a

is unchanging. It is a distracted mind, and to refer to it as “mind at birth” or “mind at death” does not violate correct reasoning.

There is a theory [by Nanda] that at birth and death the five [material] consciousnesses definitely do not exist. The mental consciousness (*mano-vijñāna*) grasps its object as a result of the [functioning of the] five [material forms of] consciousness, as a result of teaching, or as a result of *samādhi*, and since these causes are non-existent at the time of birth, then the mental consciousness must not exist then either. [We reply,] if this were the case, sentient beings born in the formless realm will be forever without a mental consciousness, because the mind in *samādhi* arises as a result of the dispersal of the mental consciousness, the five [material forms of] consciousness and teachings by others do not exist in the formless realm, and there is no cause for the appearance of the dispersed mind that brings about *samādhi*. [Nanda says,] suppose that mind in *samādhi* suddenly appears later as a result of habitual repetition. [We reply,] why does it not appear as soon as one is born in the formless realm? Also, the mental consciousness ought to appear by way of habitual repetition in both the realm of desire and the realm of form when one is first born there. If it does not appear during the first moment due to dullness and confusion, then this is the same argument we made earlier, so why bother with some other theory?

According to other schools, at the time of birth or death, etc., there is a kind of mental consciousness that is extremely subtle and whose mode of activity and objects are imperceptible. They should realize that this is [really] the eighth consciousness, because the extremely effective mental consciousness is not like this.

Also, at the moment of death, a sensation of coldness gradually is felt at the top or bottom of the body as a result of good or bad karma. This would not occur in the absence of the eighth consciousness, because the evolving consciousnesses are unable to appropriate a body, because each of the five forms of material consciousness, such as visual consciousness, has a separate support [such as the material eye], and because they are not active [at death]. The sixth [*manas*] consciousness is not in the body [at

all times], its objects are not fixed, and when it fills the body it always continues in a series, so the sensation of cold ought not to arise gradually because of it. Only mind as retribution, through the power of previous karma, is constant, is all-pervading, continues in a series, and appropriates the parts of the body, and when it leaves these areas of the body it appropriates, the sensation of cold appears, because life, heat, and consciousness are not separated. The area where the cold appears is no longer sentient, and even though [the eighth consciousness] changes and has [that part of the body] as an object, it no longer appropriates it. We therefore know for certain that the eighth consciousness exists.

34. Consciousness and Name-and-Form (*Nāma-Rūpa*)

A scripture says that consciousness and name-and-form (*nāma-rūpa*) condition each other. In this way, these two dharmas evolve by supporting each other, like two bundles of reeds, and they evolve simultaneously. In the absence of this [eighth] consciousness, the substance of the other consciousnesses would not exist.

The scripture itself explains in the following manner: name (*nāma*) refers to the four nonmaterial aggregates [such as feeling, consciousness, etc.], and form (*rūpa*) refers to the *kalala* [embryonic material body], etc. These two and consciousness persist through mutual support, like two bundles of reeds supporting each other. They perpetually evolve together, simultaneously, and never separate. The evolving consciousnesses, such as visual consciousness, are included in the category *nāma*, so without this [eighth] consciousness, what supports them? Also, it cannot be said that the aggregate of consciousness included in *nāma* refers to the five [material forms of] consciousness and that by “consciousness,” the scripture means the sixth consciousness, because

17b

constantly support name-and-form? Therefore the word “consciousness” [in the scripture] refers to the eighth consciousness.

35. The Four Nutriment

A scripture says that all sentient beings are sustained by nutriment. Without this [eighth] consciousness, the substance of nutriment in the form of consciousness would not exist. A scripture lists four kinds of nutriment. The first is the nutriment we consume in mouthfuls, which is characterized by change and destruction. It consists of flavors, smells, and contact in the realm of desire, all serving as food when [the object] changes and deteriorates. Consequently, the sense base of form (*rūpa-āyatana*) is not categorized as food eaten in mouthfuls, because form has no function when it is changing and deteriorating.

The second kind is nutriment as contact, which is characterized by contact with objects. It is impure contact that, at the moment of grasping its object, obtains satisfaction and serves as nutriment. Also, contact is associated with various consciousnesses, but it especially holds the meaning of nutriment in connection with the first six forms of consciousness, because contact with gross, obvious objects, obtaining satisfaction, pleasure, and consoling indifference are especially nourishing.

The third form of nutriment is intention, characterized by wish or aspiration. Impure intention and desire evolving together aspire to a desirable object and thus serve as nutriment. Although this intention is associated with various consciousnesses, it especially holds the meaning of nutriment in connection with mental consciousness, because that consciousness especially aspires towards objects.

The fourth kind is nutriment as consciousness, which is characterized by grasping and holding. It is impure consciousness that increases through the power of food eaten in mouthfuls, contact, and intention, and serves as nutriment. Although this kind of consciousness is common to the substances of various forms of consciousness, it especially deserves the meaning of nutriment in connection with the eighth consciousness, because it is homogeneous,

continues in a series, and is preeminent in grasping and holding [seeds]. Thus the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* speaks of four nutriments comprised in three aggregates, five sense bases, and eleven sense fields.

These four are called “nutriment” because they sustain the bodies and lives of beings and prevent their disruption and destruction. Nutriment in mouthfuls is used only in the realm of desire, and nutriment consisting of contact and intention is found throughout the three realms, but all forms of nutriment depend on the evolving consciousnesses and may or may not exist depending on whether the latter exists.

17c The evolving consciousnesses such as visual consciousness are intermittent and changeable and are not always and everywhere able to sustain body and life. For instance, they are interrupted in unconscious *samādhi*, deep sleep, fainting, and among the unconscious celestials (*asaṃjñika-deva*). Even in the state of consciousness, these evolving consciousnesses change according to the support, object, nature, realm of existence, and the [spiritual] stage of the individual, etc., and therefore they are not present everywhere or constantly to support life and body. Those who hold the theory that the eighth consciousness does not exist should explain what nutriment it is that the scripture speaks of in saying that all sentient beings are supported by food.

[Refuting the Sarvāstivādins, we say that] past and future consciousness, etc., is not nutriment in the unconscious states because it is neither present nor constant. Like [imaginary] flowers in the sky, it has no substance or function. Even if it had substance and function, it is not present, and, like space, etc., it does not function as nutriment. Nor can it be claimed that mind, etc., of someone entering *samādhi* can be nutriment for sentience in the mindless state, because when one is unconscious, mind ceases to operate, and its past is not nutriment, as we have already amply demonstrated. Nor can it be said that dharmas unassociated [with mind] serve as nutriment in the unconscious *samādhi*, because they are not included in the list of the four nutriments, such

as ordinary food, and because these dharmas have no real existence.

There is a theory [of the Sthaviras] that in the *samādhi* of cessation, the sixth consciousness still exists and serves as food for these beings, but that theory is untenable and will be refuted at length later. We need an explanation as to what the nutriment is for someone with a pure mind [in the realm of form or the formless realm], because pure mind crushes and destroys existence, and therefore it cannot serve as food for that body and life. Nor can it be claimed that impure seeds in the pure consciousness serve as nutriment, because, like *nirvāṇa*, a pure consciousness cannot hold impure seeds. Nor can it be held that the bodies and lives of sentient beings in the two upper realms sustain each other as nutriment, because body and life are not included in the list of the four nutriments. Also, no body exists in the formless realm, life has no support, and homogeneous existence (*nikāya-sabhāgatā*), etc., are lacking in real substance.

Consequently, we know that apart from the evolving consciousnesses, there is a consciousness as retribution that is homogeneous, constant, and omnipresent and that serves to sustain body and life and prevent their termination. Therefore the World-Honored One said, "All sentient beings live by means of nutriment." Even though sentience is established on the basis of the existence of the aggregates that are grasped (*upādāna-skandha*), the Buddha is lacking in impurity [and hence the grasping aggregates] and therefore is not considered to be a sentient being. When it is said that he is a sentient being and exists by means of nutriment, you should understand that this is said concerning [the Buddha's] magical display [of being sentient and requiring nutriment]. Inasmuch as consciousness as retribution has a special nature as nutriment, the consciousness characterized as nutriment is the eighth consciousness.

36. *Samādhi* of Cessation

A scripture says that the activities of body, speech, and mind of someone in the *samādhi* of cessation (*nirodha-samapātti*) are all

18a extinguished; yet life does not end, heat does not leave the body, the sense organs do not deteriorate, and consciousness does not leave the body. Apart from this [eighth] consciousness, no consciousness that does not leave the body would exist in someone in this *samādhi*. Forms of consciousness such as visual consciousness are gross and unstable in their activities and characteristics, and when they occur in relation to the objective realm, there is fatigue and anxiety, so one becomes disgusted with them and seeks to stop them for awhile, subduing them gradually to the point where they cease completely. The *samādhi* of cessation results from this state; therefore, in this *samādhi*, these forms of consciousness cease. If you do not admit the existence of a consciousness that is subtle, homogeneous, constant, and omnipresent and sustains life, [heat,] etc., how can [the scripture] speak of a consciousness that does not desert the body?

37. Refutation

If you [Sarvāstivādins] claim that consciousness returns later [after *samādhi*], like a fever that returns after a day [of absence], and that it does not leave the body, then you must not claim that mental activity ceases, because consciousness appears and disappears with such things as thought. Life, heat, and sense organs would be like consciousness [in leaving and reappearing], and that would be a great error. Therefore you must admit that consciousness, like life, heat, etc., really does not leave the body. Also, if consciousness is completely absent in this state, [the body] would resemble roof tiles or stones, not a sentient being, so how could you say that someone in *samādhi* was sentient?

Also, if consciousness as retribution does not exist in this state [of *samādhi*], what sustains the sense organs, life, and heat? Without something to sustain them, they would deteriorate and perish. One would be like a corpse, lifeless, without heat, etc. In that case, consciousness could not return. When a scripture says that consciousness does not leave the body, to what is it referring? When consciousness as retribution has left the body, it will not be born

again except in other bodies.

[In reply to a Sautrāntika theory that holds that form holds the seeds, we say,] if there is no consciousness to hold seeds during this state, how can a post-*samādhi* consciousness without seeds appear? We have already fully shown that past and future, and dharmas unassociated with mind, do not have real substances. Dharmas such as form do not exist apart from consciousness, and we have refuted the notion that they take perfuming and hold seeds. However, mindless states such as the *samādhi* of cessation, like *samādhi* in which consciousness exists, have consciousness provided with sense organs, life, and heat, because those in these states are considered to be sentient beings. From this reasoning we conclude that someone in the *samādhi* of cessation has a consciousness that does not really leave the body.

[Other Sautrāntikas] have a theory that the sixth consciousness (*mano-vijñāna*) exists in this state, and that that is why [the scripture] says that consciousness does not leave the body. This is not reasonable, because this state is also called “unconscious *samādhi*.” If you claim that the reason it is referred to as “unconscious” is that the five [sense] consciousnesses are absent, then all *samādhi* should be called “unconscious,” because all lack these five forms of consciousness. The sixth consciousness is included among the six evolving consciousnesses and, like the [first] five forms, is absent in the *samādhi* of cessation.

Also, because in this state the mode of activity and objects of this [sixth] consciousness are imperceptible, then, like life, heat, etc., it is not the sixth consciousness [that exists in this state]. [Finally,] if the mode of activity and objects of this consciousness are perceptible in this state, it must resemble other states and not really be *samādhi*, because the basic purpose for entering this *samādhi* is to stop those things.

Also, if the sixth consciousness exists in this state, then mind and its activities either exist or do not. If they exist, the scripture could not say that in this state mental activities cease completely. Nor would it be referred to as the “*samādhi* of the cessation of

18b feeling and conceptualization.” [The Sautrāntikas say that] in the preparatory stage of this *samādhi*, one is disgusted only with feeling and conceptualization, and therefore there is cessation of only feeling and conceptualization in this state. Feeling and conceptualization are strong in assisting the mind and therefore are alone called “mental activities,” so what is the problem if we speak of the cessation of mental activities? [We reply that] in the *samādhi* of nonconceptualization, only conceptualization must cease, because the individual is only disgusted with conceptualization, but you do not concede this. Since it is only feeling and conceptualization that are strong in assisting the mind, then when these two cease, so should mind. [The Sautrāntikas reply,] just as physical activities cease [in *samādhi*] but the body itself persists, why insist that mind perishes when its activities cease? [We reply,] in that case, when the vocal activities of reflection and investigation cease, the voice would not cease, but will you admit this? Activities (*saṃskāra*) of dharmas are either universal or nonuniversal. When a universal activity ceases, the dharma it conditions ceases also. When a nonuniversal activity ceases, the dharma may still exist.

An example of nonuniversal activities is inspiration and expiration, because when respiration ceases, the body may still exist. Reflection and investigation in speech are universal activities because if they cease there is no speech. Feeling and conceptualization are also universal activities of mind, because, as you admit, they, like volition, etc., are categorized as activities associated with all thought (*mahābhūmika*). When feeling and conceptualization cease, mind must cease accordingly. How can it be said that they cease while mind persists?

Also, since you admit that volition, etc., are activities associated with all thought, then when feeling and conceptualization cease, so must they. In that case, such things as faith must also not exist in this state, because when universal activities cease, the others cannot exist either, so how can you claim that they exist? Since you admit that volition, etc., are not nonexistent in this state, the same must be so of feeling and conceptualization, because they

are activities associated with all thought.

Also, if volition, etc., exist in this *samādhi*, then so must contact, because there are none of the other mental activities that are not born through the power of contact. And, if you admit that contact exists [in this state], so must feeling, because feeling is conditioned by contact. And, if you admit that feeling exists in this state, conceptualization must occur also, because they are never separated. [The Sautrāntikas reply,] just as feeling conditions craving but not all feeling does so, likewise, contact conditions feeling but not in all cases, and thus consequently your argument is not valid.

This is incorrect, because distinctions need to be made. The Buddha has summed it up by saying that “Feeling conditions and generates craving only when it is born of contact accompanied by ignorance.” Nowhere did he say that contact generates feeling. Therefore when contact exists, there will be feeling. The principle that feeling occurs with conceptualization is certain. In other words, feeling and conceptualization must not cease, as in other states, because you maintain that in this state, volition, etc., exist. If you admit this, then you reject the word [of the scripture], “cessation of mental activities,” and consequently lose the sense of “*samādhi* of the cessation of feeling and conceptualization.”

38. Mind without Mental Activities

[In reply to a Sautrāntika claim that mental consciousness without its activities exists in *samādhi*, we reply] if the mental activities do not exist, neither does consciousness, because no other mind is found apart from mental activity, because when universal mental activities cease, so does the dharma [they characterize], because feeling, etc., would not be activities associated with all thought (*mahābhūmika*), and because this consciousness [argued by the opponents] would not be associated with anything. If you admit this, then this consciousness also has no supporting objects, and will resemble form more than mind.

Also, a scripture says, “Mental consciousness is conditioned

18c by and generated by thoughts and dharmas. The union of these three is contact, and simultaneously with that arise feeling, conceptualization, and volition." If mental consciousness exists in *samādhi*, the three must be united and must therefore include contact. Since contact is always united with feeling, conceptualization, and volition, how can you have consciousness but not mental activities?

[The Sautrāntikas reply,] even though at other times the union of the three has power to produce contact and, through contact, generate feeling, etc., [still] as a result of producing disgust with mental activities prior to entering *samādhi*, in this state these three things have no power and so do not generate contact; thus feeling, etc., also do not occur. [We reply,] in that case, you ought to call it the "*samādhi* of the cessation of mental activities," not the "*samādhi* of the cessation of feeling and conceptualization." [The Sautrāntikas reply,] when disgust occurs, it is disgust with only feeling and conceptualization, and when these two cease, all other mental activities also cease. The name of the *samādhi* derives from the prior disgust with feeling and conceptualization. [We reply,] in that case, the mind must cease in this *samādhi*, because mind is associated with the feeling, etc., with which one is disgusted, just like other mental activities. Otherwise, how can it be called "mindless *samādhi*"?

Also, what is [the nature of] this mental consciousness that exists in *samādhi*? It cannot be soiled or indeterminate, for these reasons: (1) these things [impurity, etc.] do not exist in *samādhi*, which is itself categorized as "good," (2) other impure and indeterminate minds must have mental activities; (3) one cannot generate impurity, etc., by becoming disgusted with good; and (4) one does not give rise to discrimination by seeking stillness.

If you claim that [mental consciousness in *samādhi*] is [morally] good because its associates are good, then it should be associated with such roots of goodness as noncovetousness. This mind is not intrinsically good, nor is it good in the ultimate sense, because that would contradict your own doctrines, since it is not a

root of goodness or *nirvāṇa*. If you claim that this mind is good by virtue of originating from a similar cause, because it is attracted and aroused by the root of goodness of effort, your reasoning is invalid and you contradict your own tenets, because, like other good minds, it is not generated by a similar cause. A good mind may produce three kinds of minds immediately [i.e., good, bad, and indeterminate], so why does a good mind result [necessarily] from a former good mind? Thus a mind is good by virtue of its associates. In this case, it must be associated with the roots of goodness. How can you claim that this mind alone has no activities? Without mental activities, the mind itself would not exist.

We conclude that in the state of *samādhi*, the evolving consciousnesses such as visual consciousness leave the body, and consequently the statement in the scripture “does not leave the body” refers to the eighth consciousness. When one enters the *samādhi* of cessation, the *samādhi* does not end this extremely still and sustaining consciousness. This can also be understood with reference to such states as the *samādhi* of nonconceptualization (*asaṃjñika-samāpatti*).

39. Impure and Pure Dharmas

A scripture says, “Because mind is impure, sentient beings are impure; because mind is pure, sentient beings are pure.” If this [eighth] consciousness did not exist, impure and pure minds would not exist. This means that impure and pure dharmas are rooted in minds, because they are born with mind as their cause and they perish with mind as their cause, and also because mind experiences their perfuming and holds their seeds.

There are, generally speaking, three kinds of impure dharmas: the passions (*kleśa*), karma, and results [of karma], because of the distinction of various kinds. Without this eighth consciousness to hold the seeds of the passions, there would be no causes for the changing from one realm or [spiritual] stage to another or for the arising of passions after a pure thought. This is because no other dharmas

19a

can hold the seeds, and because past and future do not really exist. If you say that passions occur without a cause, then you deny the fruits of learner (*śaikṣa*) and post-learner (*aśaikṣa*), because [the passions] would appear among those who have eliminated them.

Without this consciousness to hold the seeds of karma and its results, the arising of karma and its results would occur without any cause after a change of realm or stage and after a dharma of a different species. We have already refuted other seeds and causes above.

If karma and its results are born without a cause, then karma and its results within the three realms will occur in one who has entered *nirvāṇa* without remainder. Also, the passions would appear without a cause. Also, the conditioning of consciousness by karmic predispositions would be impossible, because we have already refuted the idea that the evolving consciousnesses can hold perfuming. Also, an impure consciousness bound by rebirth does not respond to karmic predispositions, because one would have to say that name-and-form are conditioned by the karmic predispositions. Also, dharmas separated in time and space cannot act as conditions. Since this is impossible, the following [becoming being conditioned by grasping] is also not possible.

Pure dharmas are of three kinds, due to the differences of (1) mundane path, (2) supramundane path, and (3) results of elimination [of passions]. In the absence of this consciousness that holds the seeds of mundane and supramundane pure paths, pure dharmas would arise without a cause subsequent to a mind of another kind. We have already made our objections to other kinds of causes. If the two pure paths originate without a cause, then they would occur again after one has entered *nirvāṇa* without remainder, and its support [which is the physical body] would be born without a cause.

Also, the supramundane path would not initially occur, because there would be no dharma [i.e., eighth consciousness] to hold supramundane seeds, because impure dharmas are of a different type and do not cause it to arise. And, if you believe that [the path] arises without a cause, you are no Buddhist. And, if the first

[supramundane] path does not arise, neither will the later one, and in that case there will be no fruit of the paths of the three vehicles.

Without this consciousness to hold the seeds of the passions, the transmutation of the support or fruit of cutting off [of passions] does not occur. That is, when the path arises, neither actual, present passions nor their seeds exist, because impure minds and pure minds do not exist together. The path associated with the mind does not contain the seeds, because their respective natures are different, just as *nirvāṇa* is [different from the seeds].

[Replying to the Sarvāstivādins,] past, future, and [such dharmas as] acquisition do not really exist, and it is not possible for any other dharma to hold seeds. Since [then] there is nothing to be eliminated, neither is there any [path] that can eliminate, and therefore on the basis of what, and as a result of what, can the fruit of elimination [of passions] be established? [They object,] the fruit of elimination [of passions] takes place because, as a result of the power of the path, the passions are not reborn, [but we reply that] in that case, when the path first arises, one will become a post-learner, because, there being no cause, no passions will be born henceforth.

However, if you concede the existence of this [eighth] consciousness, all problems are resolved, because only it can hold impure and pure seeds. There are innumerable reasons that prove the existence of this consciousness, but this discussion has been abbreviated out of concern for prolixity. That this consciousness exists is shown in both the holy teachings and through reason. All wise people should profoundly believe in it and accept it.

Chapter IV

Manas

Having thus explained the characteristics of the first transforming consciousness, what are the characteristics of the second transforming consciousness?

NEXT, THE SECOND TRANSFORMING CONSCIOUSNESS;
THIS CONSCIOUSNESS IS CALLED *MANAS*. 19b
IT EVOLVES SUPPORTED BY THAT [*ĀLAYA*] AND WITH THAT
AS ITS OBJECT,
AND HAS THE NATURE AND CHARACTER OF THINKING.
IT IS ALWAYS ACCOMPANIED BY FOUR PASSIONS:
DELUSION ABOUT SELF, VIEW OF SELF,
SELF CONCEIT, AND SELF-LOVE,
ALONG WITH OTHERS SUCH AS CONTACT.
IT IS DEFILED AND MORALLY NEUTRAL
AND BOUND BY THE PLACE OF BIRTH.
IN THE ARHAT, THE *SAMĀDHI* OF CESSATION,
AND THE SUPRAMUNDANE PATH, IT DOES NOT EXIST.

Following the discussion of the first transforming consciousness, consciousness as retribution, it is necessary to explain the characteristics of the transforming consciousness that is thinking (*manas*). This consciousness is given the special name of *manas* in holy teachings because it surpasses all other forms of consciousness in constantly thinking. How does its name differ from that of the sixth, mental consciousness? Its name “*manas* consciousness” is a [Sanskrit compound named] *karma-dhāraya*, like the compound *ālaya-vijñāna* (“consciousness that is *ālaya*”), because the consciousness

is the *ālaya*. The name of the other [*mano-vijñāna*] is a *latpuruṣa* [compound] similar to the term “consciousness of the eye,” because the consciousness is not the same as the *manas* [but means the “*manas* consciousness”]. Holy teachings, fearful of confusing [*manas*] with the other [*mano-vijñāna*], refer to the seventh consciousness simply as *manas*. It is also called *manas* in order to distinguish it from mind [that is *ālaya* consciousness] and the [first six] consciousnesses, because it is weaker than those in its power to accumulate [seeds] and discriminate. It is only named *manas* out of a need to show that it is the immediate support of mental consciousness.

IT EVOLVES SUPPORTED BY THAT indicates its support. THAT refers to the preceding transforming consciousness [i.e., *ālaya*], because the holy teachings say that this consciousness is supported by the store consciousness. There is an interpretation [by Nanda] that this *manas* has the seeds of the other [store consciousness] as its support, not the actual consciousness, because it is not discontinuous and does not require a simultaneous support in an actual consciousness to be born. There is another interpretation [by Dharmapāla] that it is supported by both the actual [eighth] consciousness and by its seeds, because even though it is not discontinuous, it does evolve easily and is referred to as an evolving consciousness, and it is born through the simultaneous support of the actual consciousness. EVOLVES refers to perpetual movement and indicates that this consciousness is perpetually supported by that [*ālaya*] consciousness, because it grasps it as its object.

1. Meaning of “Support”

Mind and its activities have supports, and these are, in general, of three kinds. The first is support in the form of a condition as cause, which consists of its own seeds. All conditioned dharmas depend on this support, because they cannot occur in the absence of their own condition as cause.

The second is support in the form of a dominant condition, consisting of the six internal sense bases (*āyatana*). All mind and

mental activities depend on this support, because in the absence of simultaneous organs they do not evolve.

The third is support in the form of a similar and immediately antecedent condition (*samanantara-pratyaya*), which refers to the extinct prior [moment of] *manas*. Mind and its activities depend on this support, because they do not appear apart from the organ that opens up and guides. Only mind and its activities, and no other dharma, have these three kinds of supports and are called “having a support.”

2. Support as Causal Condition

As for the first support, the seeds, it is said that the seeds must have already perished before the present result is born, because the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* speaks of “already born without seeds,” and because seeds do not exist simultaneously with the sprouts, etc. There is an opinion [by Dharmapāla] that this does not prove the point, because [the above text] says that the support attracts and engenders subsequent seeds. Also, the point that seeds produce sprouts is not an ultimate truth, that the sprout appears when a seed has perished is not exhaustively demonstrated, and [we have the example of] the flame and the torch being simultaneous causes for each other. 19c

However, there is no simultaneity of cause and effect among seeds of the same species, but seeds and actual dharmas do generate each other and unquestionably exist simultaneously. Therefore, as for the meaning of “causal condition,” the *Yogācārabhūmi* [*Śāstra*] says, “Impermanent dharmas are causes of [things of] another nature and are causes of a subsequent moment of their own nature.” “Own nature” shows that the prior seeds are causes for subsequent seeds of like kind, while the words “another nature” means that seeds and actual dharmas act as mutual causes.

The *Mahāyānasamgraha* says, “The store consciousness and impure dharmas act as causal conditions for each other, just as bundles of reeds [supporting each other] exist simultaneously.” It also says, “The seeds and their results must exist simultaneously.”

Therefore seeds as supports are definitely not sequential. Even supposing that some sources say that there is a sequence in seeds and their results, you must realize that these sources are concessional. Thus [each of] the eight forms of consciousness and their activities have specific seeds as support.

3. Support as Simultaneous Condition

Next is the simultaneous support (*sahabhū-āśraya*). [Nanda says that] mind (*manas*) is the support of the five consciousnesses such as visual consciousness, because they must have it as a support when they are present. Organs such as the eye are not separate, simultaneous supports [for the five consciousnesses] because the five organs are seeds. A passage from Vasubandhu's "Twenty Verses" says,

Consciousness is born of its own seeds
And evolves appearing as an external realm of objects.
To establish [the distinction of] internal and external
sense bases,
The Buddha has said that there are ten.

The verse means that because the World-Honored One is establishing the twelve sense bases (*āyatana*), he speaks of the seeds of the five [material] forms of consciousness as being the visual organ, etc., and the perceived aspect of these five forms of consciousness as being material objects, etc.; and therefore the visual organs, etc., are seeds of the five forms of consciousness.

[Dignāga's *Ālambana-parīkṣā*] says,

Energies of form in consciousness are called the
"five organs";
Energies and objective form have been mutual causes
from beginningless time.

This verse means that the seeds in consciousness as retribution, that are able, as eyes, etc., to generate the consciousness of form, are referred to as "energies of form." These are called the "five organs," and there are no separate eyes, etc. [apart from them].

The seeds and consciousness of form constantly act as causes for each other, because the seeds and the perfuming [consciousness] alternate as causes. The seventh and eighth consciousnesses do not have this special support, because, perpetually evolving in a series, their own power is superior. The sixth, mental consciousness, has a special support, because it requires the support of mind (*manas*) in order to appear.

There is an interpretation [by Sthiramati] that says that the above explanation contradicts both scripture and reason. If the five material organs are seeds of the five forms of consciousness, there will be confusion and disorder among seeds of the eighteen sense fields. The eighteen sense fields are each said to have its own seeds, which is confirmed in many places in scripture.

Also, the seeds of the [first] five consciousnesses have different powers to generate either the seen part or the seeing part. Which of them do you refer to as “visual organ,” etc.? If you mean the seeds of the seeing part, it must be included in the aggregate of consciousness (*viññāna-skandha*). If you mean the seen part, it must be included in the external sense base (*āyatana*). In either case, you contradict the holy teaching that the five material consciousnesses are the aggregate of form (*rūpa-skandha*) categorized as an internal sense base. 20a

Moreover, if the five organs are seeds of the [corresponding] five forms of consciousness, then the five organs must be the causal condition of the five consciousnesses, and we must not say that they are the dominant condition. Also, if the organs of nose and tongue are seeds of the two [corresponding] consciousnesses, then smell and taste must exist only in the realm of desire, or the two consciousnesses will be found throughout the realm of form; and to assent to either point contradicts holy teachings.

Also, if the organs of eye, ear, and body are seeds of the three [corresponding] consciousnesses, the same difficulty arises with respect to the two stages [realm of desire and first *dhyāna*] and five stages [realm of form and four *dhyānas*]. Moreover, since the seeds of the five consciousnesses are both good and bad, the five

material organs must not be merely indeterminate. Again, the seeds of the five consciousnesses will be categorized as unappropriated, and the five organs will also not be appropriated. Also, if the five material organs are seeds of the five consciousnesses, then the seed of the mental consciousness must be *manas*, because its relationship to mental consciousness is the same as that between the five organs and their forms of consciousness. Also, the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says that visual consciousness, etc., have a triple support. If the five material organs are seeds of their [corresponding] consciousnesses, [visual consciousness, for example,] will have two supports. Also, holy teachings say that the organs of the eye, etc., are both actual dharmas and seeds. To restrict them to the meaning of just seeds is a contradiction with all the holy scriptures.

We may ignore the above problems [raised by Sthiramati] and stick to the thesis that the organs are seeds. The five material organs are seeds of karma in the form of dominant conditions within consciousness as retribution that influence the [corresponding] five forms of consciousness, and thus they are not seeds as the causal condition that generates the five consciousnesses. This both conforms to the verses [quoted above] and is in harmony with the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*.

[Sthiramati says that] these are words without real significance, for the following reasons: (1) the five material organs must not be indeterminate; (2) they must not be exclusively appropriated; (3) they must not be categorized solely as the aggregate of form; (4) they must not be exclusively internal sense bases; (5) nose and tongue must be found only in the realm of desire, and the three [other] organs [eye, ear, and body] must not be found in the five stages; (6) the karma that influences mental consciousness must be the *manas*; (7) eye, etc., would not be common to both actual dharmas and seeds; (8) they must not be material organs; (9) if the five consciousnesses are influenced by karma, then they must be categorized as indeterminate; and (10) since the five consciousnesses that are good, etc., are not influenced by karma,

the eye, etc., must not be their simultaneous support. Therefore the claim [that the organs are seeds] does not help very well.

Also, [says Sthiramati,] many places in the holy teachings say that the *ālaya* consciousness transforms to resemble the material organs, supporting bases for the organs, world receptacle, etc., so how can you deny material organs? To admit that visual consciousness, etc., transform to resemble form, etc., but not to admit that visual consciousness, etc., are transformations of the store consciousness, is to be profoundly deluded [about both store consciousness and seeds] and to contradict both teachings and reason.

However, as for the statement [in the “Twenty Verses” and the *Ālambanaparīkṣā*] that the energies or seeds are called “five organs,” its purpose is to block [the notion that] there are real material organs apart from consciousness. The names “seeds” and “energies of form” are metaphorically applied to apparent eyes, ears, etc., that are transformations of consciousness, because they function to generate the five forms of consciousness. It does not mean that material organs are karmic seeds of consciousness.

20b

Also, [continues Sthiramati,] the clearly discerning mental consciousness that has the five material realms as objects must have the five kinds of consciousness as its simultaneous support, because it must be simultaneous with the five forms of consciousness. If it does not have visual consciousness, etc., as a support, it will not be a support for them, because both have equal power, etc., to support each other.

Also, even though the seventh consciousness is not interrupted, it changes easily on the path of insight and elsewhere, and thus like the [first] six consciousnesses it must have a simultaneous support. Otherwise it would not be included among the evolving consciousnesses, and this would contradict the holy teachings that there are seven evolving consciousnesses. Therefore you must admit that it has a simultaneous support, which is the actual, present, eighth consciousness.

According to the *Yogācārabhūmi* [*Śāstra*], “There is a store consciousness; therefore, there is a *manas*; and with *manas* as a

support, mental consciousness evolves.” What this means is that it is with the actual store consciousness as its support that the *manas* exists, not as a result of its seeds. Otherwise, you would have to say that because there is a store consciousness, the mental consciousness evolves. Consequently, that interpretation contradicts scripture and reason.

Therefore [concludes Sthiramati] we must say that the first five forms of evolving consciousness must each have two simultaneous supports: the five material organs and, at the same time, mental consciousness. The sixth evolving consciousness always has one simultaneous support, the seventh consciousness. When it occurs simultaneously with the five forms of [material] consciousness, it also has them as a simultaneous support. The seventh evolving consciousness has only one simultaneous support, the eighth consciousness. Only the eighth consciousness is always unchanging, because it can stand alone and has no simultaneous support.

There is another interpretation [by Śuddhacandra] that finds the above interpretation still not totally reasonable. Since the eighth kind [of consciousness] and the others are all by nature consciousnesses, why not admit that [like them] it has a simultaneous support? And, since the seventh and eighth consciousnesses always evolve together, what is the error in admitting that they support each other? If you concede that the present consciousness is supported by seeds, you must admit that the seeds have the actual consciousness as support. The perfuming [consciousnesses] and [consciousness as] retribution are the support of birth, growth, and duration, because apart from them the seeds of consciousness cannot be born, grow, and endure.

Also, consciousness as retribution appropriates the body in the [two] realms of form and evolves with the [five] material organs as its support. As a scripture says, “The *ālaya* consciousness is disturbed by the winds of karma and perpetually evolves everywhere in a series supported by the organs.” The *Yogācārabhūmi* [Śāstra] says, “Because the six consciousnesses—visual, etc.—each have separate supports, they cannot appropriate a body provided with organs.”

If consciousness as retribution does not universally depend on the material organs for support, then, like the six consciousnesses, it must be unable to appropriate. Otherwise, the thesis [of the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*] has the error of indefiniteness.

Therefore if the store consciousness is actually functioning, it definitely has a support, the seventh consciousness. In the realm of form, it is also supported by material organs. The seeds of consciousness definitely have a support, which is consciousness as retribution. In the preliminary state of perfuming, they are also supported by the perfumer. The rest is as previously explained [by Sthiramati]. 20c

An opinion [by Dharmapāla] finds all the above points to be unreasonable, because they do not thoroughly distinguish “support” and “supported.” “Supported” means that all dharmas that are born and perish are born and endure relying on a cause and depending on conditions. All those things that are relied on are called “supports,” just as a king and his ministers support each other, etc. If a dharma is necessary, has an object, is sovereign, and causes mind and mental activities to grasp their own objects, it is a support; i.e., the six internal sense bases. Other dharmas do not have objects, are not necessary, and do not act in a sovereign manner. These [internal sense bases] are only like sovereigns, not like ministers, etc. Therefore in the holy teachings only mind and mental activities are referred to as “having a support,” while dharmas such as form are not, because they have no objects. [The text] speaks only of mental activities having mind as a support and does not say that mental activities are the support of mind, because they are not sovereign. However, there are sources that say that the support is the supported and vice versa, but all speak hypothetically in accordance with the circumstances.

Consequently, the five [material] consciousnesses have a simultaneous support that is fourfold: the five material organs and the sixth, seventh, and eighth consciousnesses, because if one of them is missing, [the five material consciousnesses] do not evolve. The supports differ, because of a common object [the five organs], because of discrimination [by the sixth consciousness], because of

impurity and purity [in the seventh consciousness], and because of being the root [on the part of the eighth consciousness].

As for the holy teachings saying that [the first five consciousnesses] are supported only by the five organs, this is because they are special supports and because they must have common objects, because they are proximate, and because they agree.

The simultaneous support of mental consciousness is twofold; i.e., the seventh and eighth consciousnesses, because if one is missing, it certainly does not evolve. Even though the five consciousnesses are simultaneous with it in grasping objects clearly, they do not always necessarily exist, and therefore they are not the support [of mental consciousness]. When holy teachings only say that it is supported by the seventh consciousness, it is because [the latter] is the impure and pure support, is categorized equally as an evolving consciousness [like the sixth], is proximate, and agrees with [the sixth].

[*Manas*,] the seventh consciousness, has a single simultaneous support, which is the eighth consciousness, because it never evolves without the presence of the store consciousness. A verse says,

Supported by *ālaya*, *manas* evolves;
Supported by mind [*ālaya*] and *manas*, the evolving
consciousnesses are born.

Ālaya consciousness has a single simultaneous support, also, which is the seventh consciousness, because without it, [*ālaya*] does not function. A text says, “Because store consciousness always evolves simultaneous with *manas*.” It also says, “Store consciousness is always supported by impurity,” which refers to the *manas*. Also, it says that there is no *manas* in three states [such as the *samādhi* of cessation], but this refers to soiled *manas*. It also says, for instance, that *ālaya* is also absent in four states, but the eighth consciousness [itself] is not absent, and the same is so here [concerning *manas*].

Even though [the eighth consciousness] is supported by the five organs in the realm of form, they do not always exist, however, and therefore are not considered to be its support. Seeds are unable presently to grasp objects of their own, and therefore they

are considered to be supported but not to be supports. As for mental activities, it should be said that they are supported by corresponding consciousnesses, in addition to their own corresponding moments of mind. Put in this way, it conforms very well to scripture and reason.

4. Similar and Immediately Antecedent Support and Initiating-Guiding Support

With regard to the initiating and guiding support [*krānta-āśraya*], there is an opinion [by Nanda] that only the sixth consciousness is the initiating and guiding support of the five [material] consciousnesses, because the latter do not continue in a series and must be attracted and generated by the sixth consciousness. Because the sixth, mental consciousness, continues in its series and is also attracted and generated by the five consciousnesses, its initiating and guiding support consists of the first six consciousnesses. Because the seventh and eighth consciousnesses continue in their own series, and because it cannot be imagined that they are generated by the other consciousnesses, they have as their initiating and guiding support only themselves.

There is an opinion [by Sthiramati] that the above argument is less than perfect. The argument can be accepted if [the five consciousnesses] are not in the stage of mastery [on the spiritual path], do not abruptly encounter [an object], or do not encounter an object that is overwhelming. With regard to the stage of mastery, it is a matter of Buddhas, etc., who extend mastery over the objective realm and whose sense organs are interchangeable [in function], spontaneous, decisive, and free of applied and sustained thought. Do the five consciousnesses not continue in a series? Also, inasmuch as the five kinds of consciousness that are results of a similar cause are attracted and generated by the power of an act of attention that is decisive, pure or impure, and [inasmuch as the five,] absorbed in their objects, cannot cease for even a second, why not admit that they continue in a series for a number of moments?

Therefore the *Yogācārabhūmi* [Śāstra] says that impure or pure [consciousness] occurs after [an instant of] decisive mentality, and, subsequent to this, visual consciousness, as consequence, either good or not good, occurs. Yet this is not the result of its own power of discrimination. As long as mental [consciousness] is not drawn to another object, for a period of time, the eyes and mental consciousness evolve in a series that is either good or not good. Other forms of consciousness—bodily consciousness, etc.—are definitely generated in the same way as visual consciousness. The meaning of this is that for a prolonged period of time, visual and mental consciousness evolve simultaneously in a series [without interruption]. Since the period of time when visual consciousness exists is not without mental consciousness, the two consciousnesses do not continue in a series and engender each other.

If an outstanding object presents itself for a series of moments, the body and mind, overawed and dazzled, cannot suddenly free themselves. At such a time, the five [material] consciousnesses must, in principle, form a series, just as they do in the burning purgatories and among the celestials whose constant pleasure makes them forget truth and goodness (*kriḍāpradūṣika-deva*). For that reason, the *Yogācārabhūmi* [Śāstra] says that when the [active] six forms of consciousness act as the similar and immediately antecedent condition for [succeeding] forms of themselves, they are called “mental faculty” (*mana-indriya*). If there were nothing but mental consciousness prior to and subsequent to the five consciousnesses, the *Yogācārabhūmi* [Śāstra] ought to say that this single consciousness is the similar and immediately antecedent condition for those [subsequent] six consciousnesses. Or, it should say that these [present] consciousnesses are the similar and immediately antecedent conditions for that [succeeding] single [mental] consciousness. Since this is not so, we know that the [first] five consciousnesses form a continuous series [without the conditioning presence of mental consciousness].

When the five consciousnesses are born, mental consciousness must exist so that it can attract a subsequent moment of mental

consciousness and make it appear, so why imagine that the five consciousnesses are its initiating and guiding support? In mindless states, sleep, and fainting, etc., mental consciousness ceases, and, when it appears again, the store consciousness and *manas* must be its initiating and guiding support, since they always continue in a series. If [mental consciousness] has as its initiating and guiding support its own prior state, why not admit the same regarding the five consciousnesses? If the latter is not so, how can the former be? 21b

When *manas* associated with the knowledge of sameness (*samatā-jñāna*) appears for the first time, it necessarily results from the sixth, mental consciousness. It must, therefore, have [mental consciousness] as its initiating and guiding support. [Also,] the sixth and seventh consciousnesses must precede perfect mirror knowledge, associated with the purified eighth consciousness, before it can appear. Also, mind as retribution is supported by defiled *manas* [seventh consciousness]. Otherwise, [in bodhisattvas,] it is associated with a good mind supported by vows of compassion.

This being the case, it must be admitted that the eighth consciousness has the sixth and seventh consciousnesses as its initiating and guiding support, and consequently the above argument [by Nanda] is not completely acceptable. We must say that the five consciousnesses [of eye, etc.] have as their initiating and guiding support any among the first six consciousnesses in accordance with their functions. The sixth, mental consciousness, uses its own previous species or the seventh and eighth as its initiating and guiding support. The seventh, *manas*, has either its own previous species or the sixth consciousness as its initiating and guiding support. *Ādāna* consciousness has as its initiating and guiding support its own previous species and the sixth and seventh consciousnesses. None of this conflicts with reason, for reasons given earlier.

[Dharmapāla] is of the opinion that the above argument is not correct. "Initiating and guiding support" refers to dharmas that have objects, that act as sovereigns, and that can act as similar and immediately antecedent conditions. That is an initiating and

guiding support that initiates, attracts, and guides so that the subsequent consciousness and mental activities are born. It is restricted to just mind and does not include mental activities. If [the previous moment of mind] does not occur simultaneously with that [subsequent moment,] we can say that the former has the power of initiating and guiding the latter. Since in one individual the eight consciousnesses occur simultaneously, how can a different species act as the initiating and guiding support? If you admit that it is a support, then [different consciousnesses] must not appear simultaneously, and different minds are not born together.

Also, several consciousnesses appear simultaneously in a single individual, in various numbers, with nothing definite [as to number], and if you allow them to act as similar and immediately antecedent conditions for each other, the same would occur with form, etc. This contradicts the holy teaching that says that only mind and mental activities are similar and immediately antecedent conditions. However, as for the statement in the *Mahā-yānasamgraha* to the effect that form may act as a similar and immediately antecedent condition, that is said rather indulgently and as a precaution. That is, it says this for the sake of argument, conceding the Small Vehicle doctrine that form is the similar and immediately antecedent condition of mind in order to forestall an argument that the former moment is a condition as cause. Otherwise, [if the statement in that treatise] is taken at face value, the prefix *sam* ["similar"] in *samanantara* would be pointless. If you say that the prefix *sam* has nothing to do with quantity but only concerns similar kinds, then you contradict your own thesis that consciousnesses of different kinds are similar and immediately antecedent conditions [for each other].

Therefore each of the eight forms of consciousness is the initiating and guiding support for its own kind only. This agrees profoundly with teachings and reason, because [dharma]s of [the same kind never occur simultaneously. Mental activities are also this kind of support for the same reasons as given for consciousness.

Even though mind and mental activities are of different kinds, they are born together, are mutually associated, combine like a

unity, arise and cease simultaneously, and must be alike in their activity; and when one initiates and guides, the others do likewise. Therefore [mental activities] unfold as similar and immediately antecedent conditions [for each other], but this is not the case with various forms of consciousness, so [mental activities] should not be used as a model.

However, mental activities are not initiating and guiding supports for the reason that they are not sovereign with respect to that which is to be attracted and generated. [Moreover,] if mind and mental activities are similar and immediately antecedent conditions for only their own species, then when the seventh and eighth consciousnesses first undergo transmutation of the support, this condition will be lacking for [such mental activities as] associated faith. This would contradict the holy teaching that mind and mental activities are generated by four conditions [including the similar and immediately antecedent condition]. 21c

Furthermore, even though mental consciousness ceases in mindless states, sleep, fainting, etc., when it reappears, its initiating and guiding support is its own former species. The same is true of the five [material] consciousnesses that have stopped, because “immediately antecedent” means that there is no break in the same species of consciousness in the interval. The reason is that when it has perished, it has already become the initiating and guiding support for the present consciousness. Why take the trouble to make a different kind [of consciousness] the initiating and guiding support?

However, when holy teachings say that the first six consciousnesses attract and generate each other, or that the seventh and eighth consciousnesses are born with the sixth and seventh as supports, this is said with reference to the special dominant condition, not with respect to the similar and immediately antecedent condition. Hence there is no disagreement.

The *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says, “If various consciousnesses are born immediately after this [present moment of] consciousness, the latter is their similar and immediately antecedent condition.” Also, when it says that “These six consciousnesses are the similar

and immediately antecedent condition of those [later] six consciousnesses and are called ‘mental organ’,” the words are general, but the intention is specific, and there is no contradiction. Therefore the support [of a specific consciousness] is its own [prior] kind, and this conforms closely to teachings and reason.

Having examined other treatises, we must return now to the right one. Even though this transforming consciousness [the *manas*] has three supports, still [Vasubandhu’s verse] refers only to the first two when it says that IT EVOLVES SUPPORTED BY THAT, because it tries to show that the support and object of this consciousness are the same; because the first two supports have the predominant functions; or because the initiating and guiding support is easy to comprehend.

5. The Object of *Manas*

Having discussed the support of this consciousness, what is its object? [Vasubandhu’s verse] says, WITH THAT AS OBJECT. THAT refers to the previous consciousness as support, because the holy teachings say that this consciousness has the store consciousness as its object.

One interpretation [by Nanda] is that the object of *manas* is the substance of that consciousness and its associated dharmas, because a treatise says that *manas* is always associated with attachment to “me” and “mine.” Taking as its object the substance [of store consciousness] and its associated dharmas, it grasps them as “me” and “mine” respectively. Because [associated] mental activities are not separate from consciousness, there is no contradiction with doctrine, in the same way the term “consciousness only” does not contradict [the fact that both consciousness and associated dharmas are included in the term].

Another interpretation [by Citrabhānu] is that that explanation is incorrect, because nowhere in scriptures is it said that *manas* has as its object such things as contact (*sparsa*). You must say that *manas* only takes as its object the seeing (*darśana*) and seen (*nimitta*) parts of this [store] consciousness and conceives them respectively as “me” and “mine.” Consciousness is the substance

of both the perceiving and the perceived, so this explanation does not contradict the holy teaching [that says that the object of *manas* is the store consciousness].

[Sthiramati says that] this explanation [by Citrabhānu] is also incorrect, because the objects of the five material organs are not included in the aggregate of consciousness, because, like the five consciousnesses, *manas* would have external objects as its objects, because, like mental consciousness, [manas] would have as its object a common object [rather than a special one], and because those born in the formless realms would not be attached to [the notion of] “mine” because [the consciousness of] those born there with a disgust for form does not evolve into form.

It should be said, rather, that *manas* has as its object only the store consciousness and its seeds, and these are grasped respectively as “me” and “mine.” Since seeds are [in reality] the energies of that consciousness and not really existing things, this explanation does not contradict the holy teaching [that the object of *manas* is the store consciousness]. 22a

[Dharmapāla] believes that the above explanations are incorrect, because seeds of form (*rūpa-bīja*), etc., are not included in the aggregate of consciousness. Also, the [Yogācārabhūmi] Śāstra says that seeds are real, because if they do not exist, they would not act as causal conditions. Also, this [manas] consciousness is born with the view of a self and freely continues in a series as a single kind, so how do you suppose that it independently grasps a self or “mine”? Two objects, such as eternity and cessation, etc., cannot be grasped separately [and simultaneously] by a single mind. Nor should it be said that it grasps the two successively, because it has functioned with a single character since beginningless time.

You must understand [says Dharmapāla] that [manas] has as an object only the seeing part of the store consciousness, not the others, because from beginningless time it has been a homogeneous series resembling something constant and unitary, and because it is always the support of all dharmas. [Manas] only grasps

that as its own inner self. The reference to “mine” [in texts] is only a manner of speaking. Or it grasps [the store consciousness] as its own self, and, therefore, the two expressions [“me” and “mine”] refer to that single seeing part. This explanation accords well with teaching and reason, because many passages speak only of the view of a self, because grasping a self and grasping a “mine” do not occur simultaneously.

When [*manas*] is still in a nontransmuted stage, it has only the store consciousness as its object, but when the transmutation of the support has occurred, it also has as its objects true suchness and other dharmas. This is because realization of the knowledge of sameness acquires ten kinds of sameness, and it realizes the differences of resolve among sentient beings and manifests itself in the images of various Buddhas. Here, [in Vasubandhu’s verse,] it only speaks of [*manas*] that is not transmuted, and therefore it says that this HAS THAT store consciousness AS ITS OBJECT, because it must be the case that awakening and delusion are free and confined [respectively], and objects of absence of self and self are universal and nonuniversal [respectively]. How can this consciousness have as its object its own support? In the same way that a subsequent consciousness takes the prior *manas* as its object, and since this creates no problem, why is there any problem [with *manas* having the eighth consciousness as both support and object]?

6. Nature and Character of *Manas*

The verses [of Vasubandhu] say, IT HAS THE NATURE AND CHARACTER OF THINKING. These two [i.e., nature and character] refer to the self-nature and mode of activity of this consciousness, because its self-nature is that of thinking, and it uses it as its mode of activity. It gets the special name of *manas* because it examines and thinks. When one has not yet undergone a transmutation of the support, it always examines and thinks about the characteristics of the self that it grasps, but once transmuted, it examines and thinks about the characteristics of the absence of a self.

7. Dharmas Associated with *Manas*

With how many mental activities is *manas* associated? [Vasubandhu's verses] say, IT IS ALWAYS ACCOMPANIED BY FOUR PASSIONS. Here, the term ACCOMPANIED means "associated with." That is, from beginningless time up to the time of transmutation, *manas* freely and perpetually takes the store consciousness as its object and is associated with four fundamental passions; i.e., DELUSION ABOUT SELF, VIEW OF SELF, SELF-CONCEIT, AND SELF-LOVE.

DELUSION ABOUT SELF means "ignorance." It is called "delusion about self" because of ignorance about the character of "self" and because of delusion about the principle of no self. VIEW OF SELF means "grasping a self." It is called "view of self" because one falsely posits a self in dharmas where there are no selves. SELF-CONCEIT means "haughtiness." It is called "self-conceit" because the mind is exalted through pride in the self that is grasped. SELF-LOVE means "craving the self." It is called "self-love" because one generates a deep attachment to the self that is grasped. ALONG WITH shows that conceit and love accompany views, and love accompanies conceit, which contradicts the opinion of other Buddhists that they are not associated. 22b

These four constantly appear to disturb and pollute internal consciousness, causing the [other] external consciousnesses to be perpetually defiled; as a consequence of this, sentient beings undergo the cycle of birth and death, unable to free themselves, and for this reason they are referred to [literally] as "afflictions" (*kleśa*).

There are [actually] ten [passions], so why are there only four [listed]? Because of the presence of belief in a self, the other views (*dṛṣṭi*) do not occur, because two discernments (*prajñā*) do not exist simultaneously in a single mind.

Why must this [*manas*] have a view of self? Because the two attachments [to opinions and to the belief in the value of mere morality and ritual] and wrong views (*mithyā-dṛṣṭi*) are born of discrimination only, and they end only with insight (*darśana*), but these innate passions are natural and innate, ending only with cultivation (*bhāvanā*). The extreme view of a "mine" occurs

in dependence on the view of a self, but the view associated with this [*manas*] does not occur in dependence on that. It perpetually grasps an inner self and for that reason must have a view of a self. [Furthermore,] as a result of the firmness of views, doubt cannot occur. Because of the love for and attachment to a self, antagonism cannot occur. Thus there are only four passions associated with this consciousness.

Why do the three, view of a self, conceit, and [self-]love occur together? Because their modes of activity are not contradictory, so there is no reason why they cannot occur together. The *Yogācārabhūmi* [*Śāstra*] says that covetousness humbles the mind while conceit exalts it, and is that not a contradiction? [No,] there is no contradiction between that text and this position, because that text and this one make distinctions. The treatise refers to discrimination, an external realm, of contempt [for others], and the gross, while we speak of the innate [passions], an interior realm, exaltation, and the subtle.

8. Other Associated Dharmas

Are there only four mental activities associated with *manas*? No, because [Vasubandhu] says, ALONG WITH OTHERS SUCH AS CONTACT. One interpretation is that this *manas* has only nine mental activities: the four passions mentioned above, plus the five dharmas that include contact. These are contact, attention, feeling, conceptualization, and volition, because *manas* is really associated with these universal [dharmas]. Previously [in Vasubandhu's verses] it was said that contact, etc., are associated with consciousness as retribution, and out of concern [that contact associated with *manas*] would be thought to be unsoiled, [as in store consciousness,] the word OTHERS is used to show that they are different from these. The word AND has the function of combining, because the former four [passions] are combined with the latter five as always associated with *manas*.

Why has this *manas* no other mental activities? Desire (*chanda*) is hope for something as yet unattained, but this consciousness

is content in taking something already attained as its object. It does not hope for anything and therefore knows no desire. Resolve (*adhimokṣa*) is acknowledgement of something still pending. This consciousness has, beginninglessly, always had something fixed as an object and therefore has no resolve. Recollection (*smṛti*) is simply remembering an event that took place in the past. This consciousness always has as an object something being experienced in the present and therefore has nothing to remember. Therefore there is no recollection. *Samādhi* holds mind steadily onto an object. This consciousness freely distinguishes its object moment by moment, and since it does not concentrate, it is devoid of *samādhi*. Discernment (*prajñā*) is the same as the view of a self and therefore it is not considered separately.

Since good [dharmas] are pure, they do not accompany this consciousness. The secondary passions originate and differentiate in successive states of the [basic] passions. This consciousness is only associated with four passions that remain in a homogeneous state in their sequence, and therefore there are no secondary passions among the associates of this consciousness. 22c

Regret (*kaukrtya*) is remorse for something done previously. This consciousness unconcernedly and perpetually takes a present event as an object and does not regret former actions. Therefore it has no regret. Torpor (*middha*) sometimes occurs for a while as a result of heaviness and dullness of mind and body due to external events, but this consciousness is beginninglessly homogeneous and uniformly attached to something within and does not rely on an external object, and therefore torpor does not occur. Applied and sustained thought (*vitarka-vicāra*) take place with respect to an external world. These are [respectively] shallow and deep investigation [of objects] and are expressed grossly or subtly in speech. This consciousness is unassociated with it, because it evolves dependent on internal matters, homogeneously attached to a self.

There is an interpretation that the [former] explanation of ORN-ERS is not correct, because [Vasubandhu's] verse says elsewhere that this [*manas*] is categorized as defiled. Also, that interpretation

omits [the fact that] *manas* is associated with secondary passions (*upa-kleśa*). Passions must be accompanied by secondary passions, and therefore the word OTHERS points to the secondary passions.

With regard to this, there is an interpretation that five secondary passions are universally associated with all impure minds. The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* says that torpor, agitation, faithlessness, indolence, and thoughtlessness are always associated with all defiled classes [of minds], because in the absence of such things as inability, defiled natures do not occur. When passions occur, the mind is defiled; therefore, mind in a defiled state must have these five [secondary passions]. The reason is that if passions occur, it is due to inability [i.e., torpor], agitation, faithlessness, indolence, and thoughtlessness. Even though agitation is found universally among defiled minds, still it increases when accompanied by craving and is therefore spoken of as a component of craving, just as regret and drowsiness, though found universally in minds of all three natures [good, bad, and undetermined], are always said to be components of delusion, because they increase in a state of delusion. Even though some sources say that either six or ten secondary passions are found in defiled minds, this universality is discussed from a different point of view and does not really mean universally present in all defiled minds.

Six secondary passions among the twenty are mentioned by separating out gross and subtle, indeterminate and bad, and obstacles to *samādhi* and discernment. Ten are mentioned among the twenty-two [of one list] by separating the two natures of gross and subtle, so those texts do not contradict our interpretation. This *manas* is associated with fifteen mental activities; i.e., the previous nine dharmas, five secondary passions, and discernment among the mental activities with specific objects (*aniyata*). Even though the view of a self is categorized as discernment among mental activities with specific objects, still the two are distinguished in the list of fifty-one mental activities and are considered to be two [different activities].

Why is this *manas* devoid of the other mental activities? The ten [mental activities] such as anger are gross in their modes of activity, but this consciousness is subtle in its discernment and is therefore unassociated with [anger, etc.]. Shamelessness (*ahrikyā*) and heedlessness of blame (*anapatrāpya*) are not good only, while this [*manas*] is indeterminate and therefore unassociated. Distraction (*vikṣepa*) makes the mind move out to external objects, but this [*manas*] arises perpetually grasping an internal object of just one kind and without concern for externals. Therefore it is not associated [with distraction]. Incorrect knowing (*asamprajanya*) generates external activities of body, speech, and mind, contradicting and exceeding the rule, but this [*manas*] only grasps internally and is therefore not associated [with inaccurate knowing]. Other mental activities missing are as discussed above. 23a

There is an interpretation that six secondary passions are associated with all impure minds. The *Yogācārabhūmi* [*Śāstra*] says, “Faithlessness, indolence, thoughtlessness, forgetfulness, distraction, and inaccurate knowing are associated with all impure minds.” In the absence of forgetfulness, distraction, and inaccurate knowing, the mind cannot generate the passions, because passions such as craving only appear when there is forgetfulness or wrong judgement regarding various kinds of objects already experienced. When passions arise, the mind necessarily roams about heedlessly, and [passions arise] as a result of distraction concerning some object. The mode of activity of agitation and torpor are mutually contradictory and cannot occur universally in all minds. When the treatise says that five dharmas are found in all defiled minds, it is because it distinguishes gross and subtle, dharmas that contradict only good dharmas, those that are purely secondary passions, and those that are common to both natures [of bad and indeterminate]. With regard to the matter of ten universals, this has been explained above.

Manas is associated with nineteen mental activities: the previously mentioned nine dharmas [such as contact], six secondary passions, along with memory, *samādhi*, discernment, and torpor.

Special mention of memory can be explained as discernment was earlier. *Samādhi* is included because [*manas*] concentrates on one single kind of thing, the self that is grasped as object, and never lets it go. Torpor is included because consciousness is very seriously associated with ignorance, making it torpid. Agitation is not included because it conflicts with torpor. The absence of other mental activities can be understood as previously explained.

There is another explanation that ten secondary passions are generally associated with all defiled minds. The *Yogācārabhūmi* [*Śāstra*] says, “Ten passions—thoughtlessness, agitation, torpor, faithlessness, indolence, wrong desires, wrong resolution, wrong memory, distraction, and inaccurate knowing—occur in all defiled minds, because they are bound to all places in all three realms.” When wrong desires and wrong resolution are not present, mind is unable to generate the passions, because passions such as craving only occur if there is satisfaction in union with, or separation from, experienced objects, along with determination of the characteristics of the object. Those who are doubtful about principles [such as suffering] are certainly not in doubt concerning such things as form. Therefore doubt is associated with resolution. With regard to doubt about things that are perceived, this is not doubt as a passion, just as doubt that a person is a post is not.

These two universals [i.e., secondary passions, wrong desire and wrong resolution] are not given as universals in other texts, because a mind that has as its object an undesirable thing or is associated with doubt does not manifest these [two] in a coarse manner. The other [mental activities that are or are not associated with *manas*] have already been discussed. This thinking mind has twenty-four mental activities; the nine previously mentioned, ten secondary passions, plus five that arise with specific objects. They can be understood according to previous principles. Other mental activities missing [from this list] can be understood in the same way as previously explained.

There is an opinion [by Dharmapāla] that all the above interpretations fail to be completely reasonable. How can one who doubts the existence of other worlds have desires or resolution? [Also,] if

there is no torpor when a state of passion arises, there will be no inability. If there is no agitation, there will be no clamor, and then, as in the case of good, etc., these will not be defiled conditions. When there is no distraction in a defiled mind, it will not go rushing out [to objects] and is not a defiled [state of] mind. And if there is no loss of recollection or inaccurate knowing, how can the passions occur in one's presence? Therefore it is certain that defiled minds are associated with eight secondary passions: torpor, agitation, lack of faith, indolence, thoughtlessness, forgetfulness, distraction, and inaccurate knowing.

As for forgetfulness and inaccurate knowing being of the nature of memory and discernment, they are not found universally in [all] defiled minds, because not all defiled minds have as their objects things already experienced nor do they contain examination. If their nature is ignorance, they occur in all defiled minds, for reasons already given.

The *manas* is associated with eighteen mental activities: the first nine dharmas [such as contact and feeling], eight secondary passions, and [one] with specific objects, discernment. As for those mental activities that are absent [from this list] that are included in the three passages from the treatises, they should be explained as above. Done in this way, there is no disagreement with teachings or reason.

9. The Feeling of *Manas*

With what feeling is defiled *manas* associated? One interpretation is that it is associated only with the feeling of satisfaction, because it perpetually clings within to a self and feels satisfaction and love.

Another interpretation denies this, because it affirms that the feeling of satisfaction exists all the way to the peak of existence (*bhavāgra*), which would contradict holy teachings. It must be said that *manas* is associated with four feelings. Born in the evil destinies, it is associated with the feeling of dissatisfaction, because its object is the fruit attracted by bad karma. Among humans, celestials

of [the realm of] desire, and the first two trances (*dhyāna*), it is associated with the feeling of satisfaction, because its object is the fruit of good karma of the stages [of development] that involve satisfaction. In the third trance state, it is associated with joy, because its object is the fruit of good karma of the stages that involve joy. In the fourth trance and up to the peak of existence, it is associated with the feeling of indifference, because its only object is the fruit of good karma of the stage that involves indifference.

23c There is an interpretation that rejects the above explanation, because from beginningless time, this [*manas*] has been perpetually unchanging in freely and exclusively grasping an inner self and is not associated with feelings [that involve] change and differentiation. Moreover, when this [*manas*] differs from the first [store] consciousness, it is distinctly mentioned. If it were associated with those four feelings, it would have been mentioned. Since it is not, *manas* is certainly the same [as store consciousness] in being associated with only indifference.

In its state prior to transmutation, *manas* is associated with the above-mentioned mental activities. Once transmuted, it occurs only with twenty-one mental activities: the [five] universals, the five with specific objects, and the eleven good ones. Like the eighth consciousness, once transmutation takes place, it is associated only with the feeling of indifference, because it always evolves spontaneously, always impartial vis-à-vis objects.

10. Moral Nature of *Manas*

What is the moral species of the mental activities of *manas*? They are defiled and indeterminate, and that is all. Because the four passions, etc., associated with *manas* are impure dharmas, they are obstacles to the holy path and obscure the mind, and hence they are said to be defiled. They are indeterminate because they are neither good nor not good. Just as in the upper two realms the passions are said to be indeterminate because they are embraced by the power of *samādhi*, so also, because the support of the defiled dharmas associated with [*manas*] is fine and subtle, and because

they evolve freely, they are said to be indeterminate. Upon the transmutation of the support, the nature of *manas* is only good.

11. Mental Activities and Spiritual Stages

To what stage (*bhūmi*) are the mental activities of *manas* connected? [The “Thirty Verses” say,] AND BOUND TO THE PLACE OF BIRTH. When [*manas*] is born in the realm of desire, the mental activities associated with the presently functioning *manas* are bound to the realm of desire, and so on, all the way to the peak of existence. The reason is that they freely and perpetually take as their object the store consciousness of that stage and grasp it as an inner self, not [the store consciousness of] other stages. If the store consciousness originates as the retribution of a certain stage, it is referred to as “born in that stage.” The defiled *manas* that takes it as its object and grasps it as a self is bound to it and is referred to as “bound to that.” Another possibility is that [*manas*] is bound by the passions, etc., of that stage and is therefore said to be “bound to them.” Once it has undergone transmutation of the support, [*manas*] is no longer bound.

12. The Cessation of *Manas*

Defiled mind (*manas*) has continued in a series since beginningless time. In what state does it either eternally or temporarily end? [Vasubandhu says in the “Thirty Verses,”] IN THE ARHAT, THE SAMĀDHI OF CESSATION, AND THE SUPRAMUNDANE PATH, IT DOES NOT EXIST. ARHAT refers generally to those in the state of post-learner among the three vehicles. In this state, the seeds of defiled mind (*manas*) and mind itself in its actual form are eternally exterminated, and therefore [Vasubandhu] says IT DOES NOT EXIST. In the state of learner it is temporarily subdued during the *samādhi* of cessation and on the supramundane path, and therefore [Vasubandhu says] IT DOES NOT EXIST.

Since beginningless time, defiled *manas* has evolved subtly, freely, and uniformly and cannot be subdued by the impure paths.

The holy paths of the three vehicles subdue it, because the understanding of true no self |occurring on the paths| contradicts attachment to a self. When pure subsequently acquired |knowledge| (*prṣṭhalabdha-anāsrava-jñāna*) is actually present, as the pure outflow |of knowledge of no self|, it also contradicts *manas*. Because both the knowledge of true no self and its subsequently acquired |knowledge| are both pure, they are called the SUPRAMUNDANE PATH.

24a THE SAMĀDHI OF CESSATION is the outflow of the holy paths and is complete calm, so this |*manas*| does not exist. However, since the seeds [of *manas*] have not yet been eternally exterminated, when one arises from the *samādhi* of cessation and the holy paths, |*manas*| becomes active again as long as |the seeds| have not been destroyed. Passions associated with this defiled mind are innate and therefore are not exterminated on |the path of| insight, but since they are impure, they are not to be exterminated. The seeds of the passions are extremely subtle and are suddenly and simultaneously exterminated, along with the lowest of the three grades of passions, at the peak of existence, because they are the same in their power. During the Diamond-like *Samādhi* (*vajropama-samādhi*) one suddenly exterminates these seeds and becomes an arhat. Therefore they never again appear in the post-learner [i.e., arhat]. If the post-learners of the two vehicles convert to the Mahayana, then from the first arousal of the thought [of enlightenment] up to the point where they become Buddhas, even though they are bodhisattvas, they are called “arhats” |in the “Thirty Verses”|. Even though they are not singled out especially, they fit the definition |of an arhat|.

13. Nondefiled *Manas*

There is an interpretation [by Sthiramati] that *manas* is only associated with the obstacle of the passions, because all holy teachings say that it does not exist in three states, that it is always associated with four passions, and that it is the support of the various defilements of consciousness.

Another interpretation claims that that explanation contradicts both teachings and reason, because a scripture says that a supramundane *manas* exists, and because an undefiled mental consciousness, just as when it is defiled, definitely must have a support that is born with it and is special. A treatise says that store consciousness definitely always functions together with a consciousness, which is *manas*, when mental consciousness occurs, [store consciousness] appears with two consciousnesses, mental consciousness and *manas*. It functions with three when one of the first five consciousnesses appears, and, finally, sometimes it occurs with all seven, when all five consciousnesses operate together. If the seventh consciousness is absent in the *samādhi* of cessation, then at that moment, the store consciousness will not be accompanied by another consciousness and therefore is not always definitely evolving in association with one consciousness. Lacking the seventh [consciousness] at the time of the holy paths, the store consciousness must be associated with one consciousness, and, in that case, how can [the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*] say that when mental consciousness appears, store consciousness definitely appears with two consciousnesses? The *Āryadeśanāvikhyāpana Śāstra* says that *manas* is always associated with four passions, or functions in association with their contraries, in either superiority or in equality, and therefore we know that *manas* can be either defiled or nondefiled.

If one concludes that arhats have no seventh consciousnesses, because, according to the [Yogācārabhūmi] *Śāstra*, they are devoid of a defiled *manas*, one must also conclude that they also must have no eighth consciousness, because treatises also say that they have no *ālaya*. However, since the latter cannot be so, is not the former also not so? Also, various treatises say that knowledge of sameness occurs upon the transmutation of the seventh consciousness, and, like any knowledge, must have as a support a pure consciousness with which it is associated. If this consciousness is missing [in arhats], that form of knowledge must also not exist in them, because in the absence of a support, there is nothing to be supported. It may not be claimed that that [knowledge] is supported by the six

evolving consciousnesses [such as visual consciousness], because it is conceded that [this knowledge] is constant in Buddhas, just as mirror knowledge is [while the six consciousnesses constantly change].

24b Also, if post-learners have no seventh consciousness, the eighth consciousness must lack a simultaneous support, but it must have this support, because it is by nature like other forms of consciousness. Also, just as attachment to a self always occurs in one who has not yet realized the nonexistence of a personal self, so also attachment to the selfhood of dharmas always occurs in one who has not yet realized the unreality of dharmas. If [*manas*] is absent, by what consciousness is this [attachment] supported? Not the eighth consciousness, because it lacks discernment. Consequently, we must trust that this [seventh] consciousness always occurs in the holy paths of the two vehicles, in the *samādhi* of cessation, and among post-learners, because these [people] have not yet realized the selflessness of dharmas.

Also, it is proven in various treatises that the seventh consciousness is the support of the sixth, because the [first] five consciousnesses are likewise supported by the sixth. If, when the holy paths arise, and when one is a post-learner, the seventh consciousness does not support the sixth, both the main point and the reasoning [of the treatises] are in error. Alternatively, the five [material] consciousnesses must lack a support, but they are always supported, and so must the sixth be supported. Therefore it is clear that in the three states mentioned above [post-learner, etc.] there must always be a nondefiled *manas*. When it is said [in some texts] that it does not exist, they speak of defiled *manas* [that does not exist, not the undefiled *manas*], just as, when they say that in four states there is no *ālaya*, they do not mean that there is no eighth [consciousness]. The same is the case here.

14. Three Kinds of *Manas*

There are, in short, three different kinds of *manas*. The first is [*manas*] associated with a view of a personal self. The second kind

is associated with a view of the selfhood of dharmas. The third kind is that associated with the knowledge of sameness.

The first is common to continuities of all ordinary beings, learners of the two vehicles, and one kind of bodhisattva of impure mind prior to the seventh |bodhisattva| stage. This |*manas*| takes as object *ālaya* consciousness and generates a view of a personal self.

The second is common to the continuities of all ordinary beings, disciples (*śrāvaka*) and *pratyekabuddhas*, and bodhisattvas in the state when the fruit of the knowledge of the emptiness of dharmas is not present. This |*manas*| takes consciousness as retribution for an object and generates the view of the selfhood of dharmas.

The third is common to the continuities of all Tathāgatas and to bodhisattvas in the path of insight, and to those for whom the fruit of the knowledge of the emptiness of dharmas is present in the path of cultivation. |The *manas*| takes as an object nondefiled consciousness as retribution, etc., and generates the knowledge of sameness.

In the state when the view of a personal self occurs, the view of the selfhood of dharmas must also be present, because attachment to a self occurs supported by attachment to dharmas, just as the notion that there is a person, etc., occurs when we misapprehend a post, etc., in the dark. Even though the functioning of the two views of selves and dharmas is different, they are not contradictory, and both have the same discernment as a support, in the same way that even though the various consciousnesses such as visual are alike in substance, their many functions of distinguishing blue, etc., are not contradictory. It is the same here [with the two views].

Even though attachment to dharmas remains only among learners of the two vehicles on the holy paths and in the *samādhi* of cessation, among bodhisattvas who awake suddenly on the path of cultivation, and among learners who awaken gradually and for whom the fruit of the knowledge of the emptiness [of the person] is present, attachment to a self has been subdued. Even though there is attachment to dharmas only among learners of the two vehicles, those gradually awakened, and those for whom the fruit

of the knowledge of the emptiness of dharmas is not present, the attachment to a self has been eliminated.

24c From the eighth stage on, attachment to a self is forever inactive among all bodhisattvas, because it is either forever eliminated or forever subdued. Even though attachment to dharmas occurs when the fruit of the knowledge of the emptiness of dharmas is not present, there is no contradiction. As a scripture says, “From the eighth stage on, none of the passions is ever active again. There remains only the obstacle to that which is to be known as the support.” It is this obstacle that remains, not the seeds. Otherwise, the passions would exist also.

Even though the *manas* associated with attachment to dharmas is said to be undefiled as far as the two vehicles are concerned, it is said to be defiled as far as bodhisattvas are concerned, because it is an obstacle to their knowledge [of reality]. Consequently, it is said to be defiled and indeterminate. As far as the two vehicles, etc., are concerned, it is unsoiled, because it does not obstruct their knowledge.

[*Manas*] is categorized as “born of retribution.” It is so called because it is perpetually born from retribution consciousness (*vipāka-vijñāna*). It is not “fruit of retribution” (*vipāka-phala*; i.e., result of good and bad), because this name [fruit of retribution] is common [to all indeterminate dharmas], in the same way that all conditions are dominant conditions except those excluded [such as condition as cause].

15. Proofs of the Existence of *Manas*

How must we know that the seventh consciousness has a separate substance of its own, apart from such consciousnesses as visual consciousness? Through the established means of knowledge of holy teachings and proper reasoning.

In many places in the scriptures, the Blessed One says that mind (*citta*), thought (*manas*), and consciousness (*vijñāna*) have three distinct meanings. That which accumulates [seeds] and generates [an apparent world] is called “mind.” That which thinks

and reasons is called “thought.” That which discriminates is called “consciousness.” These are the three distinct meanings.

Though these three meanings are used for all eight forms of consciousness, if we take into account the preeminent character of each, the eighth [consciousness] is called “mind” because it accumulates the seeds of dharmas and produces all dharmas. The seventh consciousness is called “thought” because it takes the eighth consciousness, etc., as an object and constantly thinks about it as a self, etc. The remaining six [forms of consciousness] are called “consciousness” because they evolve discriminating six different kinds of objects in a manner that is gross, unstable, and intermittent. A verse in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* says,

Store consciousness is called “mind”;
That of a thinking nature is called “thought”;
That which discriminates the characteristics of objects
Is called “consciousness.”

Also, many places in Mahayana scriptures specifically speak of a seventh consciousness; therefore, it exists separately. As already mentioned at length, Mahayana scriptures are the means of knowledge (*pramāṇa*) of supreme teachings; we need not prove that again.

Also, the *Vimokṣa Sūtra* specifically mentions the seventh consciousness. A verse says,

Defiled mind at all times
Is born with and perishes with the passions.
Once liberated from the passions,
They exist not in the past or future.

The scripture itself explains the verse, saying, “Since beginningless time, defiled *manas* has been born with and perishes with four passions: the view of a self, self-love, conceit in self, and delusion about self. Once the antidote appears and the passions have been exterminated, this *manas* is accordingly liberated from those. At that time, passions associated with *manas* not only no longer exist at present, they will have no past or future, because past and future have no

self-nature.” There are teachings like this among many schools of Buddhism, but we will stop here out of concern for proximity.

16. The Problem of Special Ignorance

Now that we have quoted the scriptures, we display proper reasoning. A scripture says, “Special ignorance (*āveṇika-avidyā*) is subtle and perpetually active and obscures reality.” If this consciousness did not exist, neither would that [ignorance]. That is, ordinary beings of all moral kinds perpetually generate deluded reasoning, a special ignorance, that obscures reality and obscures the eye of holy discernment. A verse says,

When the mind of reality is about to occur,
It is always obscured.
It accompanies all moral kinds of mind
And is called “special ignorance.”

Therefore a scripture says, “Beings of all kinds live perpetually in a long night, blinded by ignorance, and, their minds stupefied and intoxicated, they will never awaken.” If ordinary beings occasionally did not generate this ignorance, the scripture would be contradicted, because it does not stand to reason that among ordinary beings, delusive reasoning and ignorance are sometimes active and sometimes not. It is not possible [for ignorance] to be supported by the six [sense] consciousnesses, because [since they are intermittent] ignorance would be intermittent and [the six consciousnesses] would always be defiled [which is not the case]. These problems are eliminated if the existence of *manas* is admitted.

Defiled *manas* is always associated with four passions. Why is the ignorance associated [with *manas*] referred to as “special”? One interpretation is that the associated view of self, pride in self, and self-love are not fundamental passions (*mūla-kleśa*), so there is no problem in referring to ignorance as “special.”

Another interpretation is that the above explanation violates reason and teachings, because these three [such as self-pride] are not referred to as pure secondary passions, because they are

included among the six or ten passions. Many places in scripture say that defiled *manas* is always associated with four passions. You should say that of the four passions, ignorance is predominant, and that although it arises with the other three it is called “special.” [*Manas*], from beginningless time, has perpetually stupefied and deluded, without ever being aware, because of the predominance of delusion. Those existing with it, such as the view [of a self], should be called “associates,” but if they are predominant, they must be called “special,” because there is no error in conceding that they are like ignorance.

There is another interpretation that says that this delusion is named “special” because, like “special Buddha dharmas” [i.e., reserved for Buddhas], it is found only in this consciousness. In that case, passions associated with other forms of consciousness but absent in this consciousness should [by analogy] be called “special.” [But, it is replied,] the name “special” is applied as a result of its special nature, not because of its absence [or presence]. The ignorance associated with the seventh consciousness from beginningless time is always functioning, obstructing the knowledge of reality. Such a preeminent function is absent in the other consciousnesses, and since it exists only in this consciousness it is therefore named “special.”

But if this were the case, the [other] three associated with *manas* ought to be called “special.” [However,] ignorance is predominant and alone has this name. Even admitting that the other three are also special, we speak of [ignorance] as special in contrast to other delusions [such as that of the sixth consciousness].

This special ignorance is, in general, of two kinds. The first is special ignorance that is perpetual, which does not exist in other forms of consciousness. The second kind is special ignorance that is isolated, which does not exist in this [seventh] consciousness. Therefore the *Yogācārabhūmi* [*Śāstra*] says that there are two kinds of ignorance. When it is accompanied by craving, etc., it is called “associated ignorance.” When not accompanied by craving, etc., it is called “isolated ignorance.” That which is isolated and

25b predominant is eliminated (*heya*) only by [the path of] insight (*darsāna*). As a scripture says, “Those saints who are still learners have already eliminated special ignorance and therefore do not accumulate new karma.” That which is isolated but not predominant is eliminated (*heya*) by [the path of] cultivation (*bhāvanā*), because anger [and other secondary passions] are eliminated by both insight and cultivation. Other schools of Buddhism do not recognize special ignorance that is perpetual, but both [Mahayana and Hinayana] recognize special ignorance that is isolated.

17. Mental Consciousness and Its Two Conditions

A scripture says, “With the eyes and forms as its conditions, visual consciousness is born,” etc., ending with “with mind (*manas*) and dharmas as its conditions, mental consciousness is born.” If this [seventh] consciousness did not exist, neither would mental consciousness. That is, just as the five [material] consciousnesses must have eyes, etc., as a dominant, special, and simultaneous support, mental consciousness, as one of the first six kinds of consciousness, must also have such a support. If this consciousness did not exist, how could [the sixth] be supported? It cannot be said that form is its support, because *manas* is not form, and [if it were,] mental consciousness would be deprived of the two discriminations of memory and conjecture. Nor can it be claimed that the five [material] consciousnesses have no simultaneous support, because they do evolve simultaneously with the five organs, just as a sprout and its shadow do. Also, consciousness must have the same perceptual object as the organ and, like mind and mental activities, must also occur simultaneously.

It follows from this reasoning that mental consciousness, which has been amply demonstrated, like visual consciousness, etc., must have a support that is special, that is the sense base (*āyatana*) of its name (*mana-āyatana*), is not categorized as an immediately antecedent condition, and is a dominant condition, because [mental consciousness] has been shown to be without doubt one of the [first] six consciousnesses.

18. The Name of *Manas*

A scripture says, “Thinking is called *manas*.” If this consciousness did not exist, neither would that [thinking]. [In reply to a suggestion that *manas* refers to past mind,] when mental consciousness is present, the *manas* that is similar and antecedent has perished and no longer exists [and therefore it cannot think], because past and future do not really exist, and therefore the functioning of thought certainly cannot be present. This being so, how can we speak of that as *manas*? [As for speaking metaphorically of past *manas* as thinking,] to say that the expression, “thought,” is used metaphorically makes no sense, because if there is no thinking per se, what is the basis of the metaphor? If it is claimed that thought was present [at a previous moment] and that is what *manas* is, then if it was called “consciousness” at that time, how can you call it *manas* [since it no longer exists]?

Thus we know that there is a separate seventh [consciousness], *manas*, that perpetually judges and thinks, and we may properly refer to it as *manas*. We may metaphorically speak of *manas* when it has perished and, on the basis of this, speak of it as [present, real] *manas*.

19. The Two *Samādhis*

A scripture speaks of the *samādhi* of nonconceptualization (*asaṃjñika-samāpatti*) and that of cessation (*nirodha-samāpatti*). If defiled *manas* did not exist, there would be no distinction between the two [since *manas* ceases in the second but not in the first]. Both *samādhis* alike stop the six [sense] consciousnesses and mental activities, with no difference in the substance or number [of mental activities] that cease. Lacking a defiled *manas*, how could the two *samādhis* be distinguished, since one has it and one does not? If you distinguish on the basis of preparatory practices, real, stage, support, etc., this is not good enough, because the basis for the distinction is the existence [of *manas*]. Absent this *manas*, the reason [for these distinctions] would not exist either. It is certain that there is a separate *manas*.

25c

Also, a scripture says the minds and mental activities of sentient beings without thought [in the higher realms of the celestials] cease for their entire lifetimes. If this consciousness did not exist, they would have no defilement. These beings are without the six evolving consciousnesses for a long time, and without a *manas* there would also be no self-attachment. There is no other place where, for an entire lifetime, beings still in bondage are lacking in self-attachment. If they had no self-attachment, their existence would resemble *nirvāṇa*, not what sages and virtuous people alike disparage and loathe.

[The Sarvāstivādins claim that] there is [thought] at the beginning and end [of the lives of the unconscious celestials] and that therefore there is no such error. [We reply,] for a long time during the interval [of their existences] there is none, and therefore, there is an error. [They reply,] it exists in the past and future, so there is no error. [We reply] that [past and future attachment] is neither present nor eternal and that since it does not exist, the error remains. There can be no acquisition because there is nothing to be acquired. [Replying to the Mahāsāṃghikas,] we have already disproved unassociated dharmas [as a basis for self-attachment]. [In reply to the suggestion that seeds serve as the basis for attachment,] since [in their opinion] there is no such thing as a store consciousness, perfuming cannot take place either, and we have refuted the notion that other dharmas can take perfuming. Therefore there must be a separate, defiled *manas*. The attachment to a self occurs perpetually among the unconscious celestials [because of its persistence], which is why that state is disparaged and loathed by sages and the virtuous.

20. Absence of Self-Attachment

A scripture says when the minds of sentient beings are good, defiled, or indeterminate, they are perpetually caught up in self-attachment. If this [seventh] consciousness did not exist, neither would that [attachment].

When the minds of sentient beings are of these [above] three natures, they always become attached to an inner self, no matter what kinds of external acts they perform. As a result of this attachment to a self, such acts as giving (*dāna*) that arise in the six consciousnesses are unable to be free from the image [of a self]. Therefore the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says that defiled *manas* is the support of the [first] six consciousnesses, and until it ends [the seeing part] cannot be freed from bondage to the seen part. Once *manas* ceases, [the seeing part] is liberated from bondage to the seen part.

“Bondage to the seen part” means the inability to comprehend thoroughly that images of objects are like illusions, etc. Consequently, the seeing part is bound by the seen part, and this is called “bondage to the seen part.” For this reason, a verse says,

Such a defiled *manas*
Is the support of consciousness;
Until this *manas* ceases,
The bonds of consciousness are never severed.

Also, when a mind is good, undefiled, and indeterminate, it will not be contaminated if there is no self-attachment, because the passions of the [first] six consciousnesses as part of a [personal] series cannot exist simultaneously with a mind that is good, etc., because the truth is that [this good mind] cannot be bound by past or future conditions, which really are nonexistent. Also, [good mind] is not soiled by the passions of another, nor does it become pure as a result of someone else’s liberation. Nor can it be said that there exist separate propensities in the form of [dharma] unassociated [with mind] that appear in a series and that good [minds], etc., become soiled as a result of them. These do not really exist, as we have already amply demonstrated. Nor can it be said that good, etc., become soiled because they are born of soiled seeds, because there is no reason for these seeds to become soiled. [Mind that is good, etc.] does not become soiled because of soiled seeds, because it is not clear how an unsoiled mind becomes soiled.

26a

Even though acts such as giving, etc., are attracted by passions, [the acts] do not occur simultaneously [with the passions], and therefore these [passions] are not the real cause of impurity, because the word “impure” indicates simultaneity of soiling [and being soiled]. Also, indeterminate acts are not attracted by the passions, so how can they become soiled?

All impurities result from various passions of one’s own [and not from another’s], from actually present passions [and not from seeds], and from passions that are born simultaneously [with mind] and that perish simultaneously [with it], and they are born in the reciprocal promotion. This perfuming creates the seeds of soiled dharmas, and later those [dharmas] that appear will become soiled. This being so with ordinary beings, so also with learners. Even though the soiled [*manas*] of post-learners is not accompanied by [active] soiling itself, it becomes soiled by means of soiled seeds from previous times, so there is no violation of reason.

Due to the perpetual attachment to a self by the *manas*, dharmas that are good, [bad,] etc., are made soiled. If this mind did not exist, that [soiling process] would not exist either. Therefore we know that there must be a separate seventh consciousness. There are a great many proofs for the existence of this consciousness. Here, six from the *Mahāyānasamgraha* have been taken up briefly. The wise should follow them, trust them, and study them. Some scriptures speak of only six consciousnesses, but you should realize that this is an expedient [for those unprepared for the whole explanation]. Another explanation is that these texts speak of six in accordance with the six organs that act as the supports [of the six consciousnesses], but there are in fact eight separate kinds of consciousness.

Chapter V

The Six Kinds of Sense Consciousness

Now that the second transforming consciousness has been discussed, what are the distinguishing characteristics of the third transforming [consciousness]? The verses [by Vasubandhu] say,

NEXT IS THE THIRD TRANSFORMING CONSCIOUSNESS,
WITH ITS SIXFOLD DISTINCTION.
ITS NATURE AND CHARACTER IS THAT OF PERCEPTION
OF THE OBJECT,
AND IT IS GOOD, BAD, OR NEITHER.

The Treatise says that after discussing the transforming consciousness that thinks, we must discern the characteristics of the transforming consciousness that perceives the object.

1. Names of the Six Consciousnesses

There are, in summary, six kinds of this consciousness, because of differences of kind among the six organs and their objects. They are called visual consciousness, etc., ending with mental consciousness. The name of each [form of consciousness] is established according to the organ, in five ways: [consciousness] is supported [by the organ]; it is the expression [of the organ]; it is affiliated [with the organ]; it aids [the organ]; and it is similar to the organ.

Although all six consciousnesses evolve supported by [the seventh consciousness,] *manas*, the name “*manas* consciousness” (*mano-vijñāna*) [the sixth of the six consciousnesses] is derived

from its special [support], just as the other five consciousnesses [although also supported by *manas*] are distinguished [according to their special supports]. Or it is called *manas* consciousness because its sole support is *manas*. The [six] names come from the distinction [of forms] of consciousness, with the mind (*citta*) and *manas* being exceptions.

Or, we speak of consciousness of form, etc., ending with the consciousness of dharmas, in accordance with the object of the consciousness, because this is what “consciousness” means, which refers to the perception of six kinds of objects. The [first five,] including consciousness of form, etc., only perceive form, etc., but consciousness of dharmas [by the sixth consciousness] is able to perceive all dharmas [including form, sound, etc.]. Or, it is called “consciousness of dharmas” in that it alone is able to perceive dharmas. Therefore, the names of the six consciousnesses do not get confused. Hereafter, names of these consciousnesses that are established in accordance with their objects are given when they are not yet free of dependence on material organs. Once they are free, the organs are interchangeable in their functions, with one organ provoking a consciousness of any kind of sense object. Then they are only named according to the organ so as not to have any confusion.

As for the *Mahāyāna Sūtrālaṃkāra* saying that each of a Tathāgata’s five sense organs functions relative to all five kinds of objects, the text is referring to gross, obvious objects of the same kind [as the organ]. The *Buddhabhūmi Sūtra* says that knowledge of perfecting the work [of benefitting oneself and others] ascertains the countless differences of mental activities of sentient beings, generates the transformation of the three actions [of body, speech, and mind], and performs the four predictions, etc., because if it were not universal, this ability would not exist.

However, objects and supports of these six evolving consciousnesses are well known, being gross and obvious, and hence they are not discussed here. We have already discussed their supports and will discuss their objects [later on].

2. Nature and Mode of Activity

Next [Vasubandhu] says, ITS NATURE AND CHARACTER IS THAT OF PERCEPTION OF THE OBJECT. This shows both the self-nature and the mode of activity of the six consciousnesses, because these consciousnesses have the perception of objects as their essential nature, and using that is their mode of activity. Therefore we understand why separate names are given, which is that they are able to perceive and discriminate objects. A scripture asks, "What is visual consciousness? It is that which perceives and discriminates forms in dependence on the visual organ. What is mental consciousness? It is that which perceives and discriminates all dharmas in dependence on the thinking organ." The scripture just speaks of special supports in the state prior to the transmutation of the support, of what is perceived by the seeing part [of consciousness itself]. Other supports and perceptions are as already explained.

3. Moral Species

What is the moral species of these six consciousnesses? [Vasubandhu says,] GOOD, BAD, OR NEITHER. NEITHER means "indeterminate," because they can be neither good nor bad. GOOD is so called because it benefits one in this life and in a later life. The fruit of happiness among humans and celestials, although beneficial in the present life, is not beneficial in a later life, and it is therefore not said to be "good." BAD is that which is disadvantageous in this life and in a later life. The fruit of suffering among the evil destinies, although disadvantageous in the present life, is not disadvantageous in a later life, and it is therefore not said to be "bad." INDETERMINATE is so called because it cannot be determined to be good, bad, beneficial, or disadvantageous. If these six consciousnesses are associated with the eleven mental activities such as faith, they are categorized as "good." Associated with the ten dharmas such as shamelessness, they are categorized as "bad." Unassociated with any of the above, they are categorized as "indeterminate."

There is an interpretation that the three [moral] natures cannot occur simultaneously in the six consciousnesses, because there will be a contradiction [of natures] when consciousness evolves vis-à-vis the same external realm. Also, the [first] five consciousnesses must be guided and directed by mental consciousness, be simultaneous with it, have the same object, and become good or defiled [accordingly]. If we admit that the three natures occur simultaneously in the [first] five consciousnesses, then at that moment, mental consciousness must share all these natures, and that violates reason. Therefore they must not be simultaneously present. The *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* and other texts say that store consciousness during a single moment arises with these three natures in association with the evolving consciousness, but that refers to numerous moments [of store consciousness], in the same way that when these texts speak of a single thought, it is not a single generation and cessation. Thus there is no contradiction here.

There is another interpretation that it is possible for the three natures to be simultaneously present in the six consciousnesses, because many or few of these consciousnesses, such as visual consciousness, may arise simultaneously, either suddenly or one after another. Although the [first] five consciousnesses always occur together with mental consciousness, they are not necessarily the same in being good, etc. The above difficulties that were said to exist are irrelevant here.

The *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says, “Should someone arise from *samādhi* due to encountering a sound, auditory consciousness occurs together with the [morally good] mental consciousness associated with *samādhi*. It is not just mental consciousness alone, associated with *samādhi*, that experiences the sound. If it were, one would not hear the sound and leave *samādhi*. One does not leave *samādhi* the instant the sound is heard; one leaves it at the instant sound is heard and there is some kind of expectation.” Auditory consciousness suddenly hearing a sound during *samādhi* must not be good, because in one who has not yet experienced the transmutation of the support, the sudden lapse into thought is

26c

necessarily indeterminate. This proves that mental consciousness associated with the other five consciousnesses is not necessarily of the same moral species. Texts only say that mental consciousness associated with the [other] five consciousnesses also has the same objects, not the same nature.

When the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-vyākhyā* says that the five consciousnesses are absent during *samādhi*, it means for the most part. If the three natures evolve simultaneously in the five consciousnesses, then mental [consciousness] will be of the same nature as the consciousness [in question] insofar as both have a special attention directed toward an object. However, without this special attention, its nature is indeterminate. Therefore it is possible for the three natures to occur simultaneously among the six evolving consciousnesses. These consciousnesses are good only in a state of liberation, because the form and mind of a Buddha are included in the truth of the path (*mārga-satya*), because a Buddha has forever destroyed all seeds of idle discourse.

4. Associated Mental Activities

With how many mental activities are the six consciousnesses associated? |Vasubandhu's| verses say,

THEY ARE ASSOCIATED WITH UNIVERSAL MENTAL ACTIVITIES,
THOSE WITH SPECIFIC OBJECTS, THE GOOD, THE PASSIONS,
THE SECONDARY PASSIONS, THE NONDETERMINED,
AND ALL THREE FEELINGS.

The Treatise says that the six evolving consciousnesses are, in general, associated with these six kinds of mental activities; i.e., the universals, etc.

5. The Name “Mental Activities”

They are called “mental activities” because they always occur in dependence on the mind, are associated with the mind, and belong to the mind, just as the word “mine” is that which belongs to “me.” The mind has only general characteristics as its objects, but mental

activities grasp their specific characteristics. Mental activities aid the mind and promote its business, hence the name, just as the master painter draws the outlines and the student fills in the colors.

This is why the *Yogācārabhūmi* [*Śāstra*] says, “Consciousness perceives general characteristics of the event, while attention (*manaskāra*) grasps the characteristics [that consciousness itself] has not yet grasped; i.e., the specific characteristics grasped [only] by mental activities. Contact (*sparsā*) perceives agreeable characteristics, etc. Feeling (*vedanā*) perceives comforting characteristics, etc. Conceptualization (*saṃjñā*) perceives characteristics that cause speech. Volition (*cetanā*) perceives characteristics that are causes of what is correct, etc. Therefore attention, etc., are called ‘mental activities.’” This also shows that mental activities also have general characteristics as objects.

Other sources say that desire (*chanda*) also perceives the characteristics of pleasant things, resolve perceives the characteristics of events that are definite and certain, memory (*smṛti*) perceives the characteristics of already familiar events [that are past], and *samādhi* and discernment perceive such characteristics as virtue and demerit. As a result of these [mental activities], good, impurity, etc., are generated vis-à-vis objects. All these mental activities equally experience the specific characteristics of their objects [as well as general ones].

6. Various Kinds of Mental Activities

Although all mental activities go by the general name “mental activities,” there are in fact six kinds: five universal mental activities, five with specific objects, eleven good ones, six passions, twenty secondary passions, and four indeterminates. Thus there are fifty-

27a

[The universal mental activities are so called] because they definitely can be found in all minds. [Those with specific objects are so called] because they occur when objects are specific. [Good mental activities are those] that are only born in good minds. [The passions are so called] because they are categorized as fundamental passions

by nature. [The secondary passions (*upakleṣa*) are so called] because they are by nature only modalities of passions. [Indeterminate mental activities] are those found in good minds, impure minds, etc.

The *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* combines the six kinds into five, because both passions and secondary passions are defilements. In addition it explains the differences among the five in terms of the four “alls”; i.e., found in all natures, in all stages, in all times, and occurring together. Of the five, universals have all four “alls”; those with specific objects have only the first two “alls”; good mental activities possess one, which is that they occur in all stages; impure mental activities have none of the four “alls”; and the undetermined mental activities have only one, which is that they exist in all natures. This is how the five classes are distinguished.

7. The Three Feelings

These six evolving consciousnesses are prone to slip away and are not fixed, and therefore all can be associated with the three feelings (*vedanā*), because they experience characteristics that are agreeable, disagreeable, and those that are neither. The experience of agreeable objects comforts and delights body and mind and is called the “feeling of pleasure” (*sukha*). The experience of the characteristics of disagreeable objects troubles body and mind and is called the “feeling of suffering” (*duḥkha*). The experience of characteristics of neutral objects is called the “feeling of neither pleasure nor suffering.”

Each of these feelings can be divided into two. When associated with the five [sense] consciousnesses, it is said to be of a physical kind, because of its special dependence on the body. When associated with [the sixth,] mental consciousness, it is said to be mental, because of its dependence on just the mind.

Also, the three feelings may be either impure or pure, because the feeling of pain also occurs as a result of pure [dharma]s. Or, each feeling may be seen as threefold: to be eliminated (*heya*) by [the path of] insight, to be eliminated by [the path of] cultivation, and not eliminated. Or, [they may occur] in learners, post-learners, or by

neither. Or, they may be seen in general as being fourfold: good, not good, impure and indeterminate, and pure and indeterminate.

There is an interpretation that each of the three feelings can be fourfold. Because spontaneous craving and delusion that occur with the [first] five consciousnesses and spontaneous passions of the destinies of pure suffering do not generate any karma, they are indeterminate and can be associated with the faculty of suffering. The *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says, “When all passions are generated spontaneously, they may occur in connection with three feelings. When they occur in all consciousnesses, they are associated with all faculties, and when not occurring in all consciousnesses, they are associated with all faculties in the realm of *manas*.” The *Abhidharmasamuccaya-vyākhyā* says, “When spontaneous passions related to the realm of desire produce evil actions, they are not good. All others are impure and indeterminate.” Therefore we know that each of the three feelings can be fourfold.

8. The Five Feelings

[Feelings] can be divided into five kinds: suffering (*duḥkha*), pleasure (*sukha*), sorrow (*daurmanasya*), delight (*saumanasya*), and indifference (*upekṣā*). Suffering and pleasure can each be divided into two, because characteristics of annoyance and delight differ according to whether they are physical or mental, whether they accompany or do not accompany discrimination, and whether they are heavy or light. That which is neither pleasant nor painful is not divided like this, because being neither annoying nor pleasing, there is no distinction of characteristics, there is no discrimination, and it evolves uniformly [as neither heavy nor light].

27b The feeling of delight associated with the five [sense] consciousnesses is always called “pleasure.” Associated with mental consciousness when it occurs in the realm of desire and in the approaches to the first two trance states (*dhyāna*), it is called “delight,” because it only delights the mind. During the first two trance states, it is called both “pleasure” and “delight,” because it delights [both] body and mind. In the approaches to the third trance state, and in the

actual trance state, it is called “pleasure,” because it is calm, heavy, and without discrimination.

The feeling of oppression associated with the [first] five consciousnesses is always called “suffering” (*duḥkha*). Associated with mental consciousness, according to one interpretation, it is nothing but sorrow, because it oppresses the mind, and because the holy teachings say that the feeling of discomfort in the realm of thought is called the “faculty of sorrow.” The *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says, “As soon as retribution commences among those sentient beings in the purgatories, there is retribution that generates a feeling of sorrow.” It also says, “[Those in] the purgatories also have the sorrow of applied and sustained thought, as do a part of animals and hungry ghosts (*preta*). Therefore we know that feelings of heavy discomfort in the realm of *manas* are called “sorrow,” and even more so are the other light [discomforts].

There is an interpretation that [sorrow] takes two forms. Among humans and celestials, it is always called “sorrow,” because it is not heavy. Among animals and hungry ghosts, it is called either “sorrow” or “suffering,” because the feeling may be heavy or light depending on whether the feeling is pure or mixed. In purgatory (*naraka*), it is called “suffering,” only because the feeling is unadulterated, heavy, and without discrimination. The *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says, “The three feelings can be active with all spontaneously generated passions.” The details are as mentioned earlier.

[The *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*] also says, “The innate view of a person is only indeterminate in nature, and the same must be true of extreme views.” Suffering accompanying these [views] is not categorized as the faculty of sorrow, because the treatise says that the faculty of suffering is not indeterminate. It also says, “In the purgatories, the other three [faculties] definitely do not occur, and that is also the case with animals and hungry ghosts whose suffering is unadulterated.” The “other three” are certainly pleasure, delight, and sorrow, because these beings must be provided with active indifference.

[It is objected,] is it not true that adventitious indifference is not active among them? [We reply,] how do you know that the passage [from the treatise] is speaking only of adventitious feelings? You must not say that those beings definitely possess the faculty of thought, because the six adventitious consciousnesses are sometimes absent. It must not be that the treatise is speaking only of adventitious feelings, because there is no reason for speaking of the faculty of thought. Also, if the treatise is speaking with reference to adventitious feelings, how can we definitely speak of those beings as having eight faculties?

If you claim that the eighth is the faculty of sorrow, because the five [sense] consciousnesses do not form an unbroken series, then how can the faculty of sorrow exist at birth, death, and in a faint? We offer the same objection to the opinion that the eighth faculty is the faculty of suffering. The opinion that the eighth faculty is the sex organ is unreasonable, because a sex organ is uncertain [in the purgatories], because due to evil karma [beings] can be sexless. They must have eyes, etc., because the five organs are made to suffer as a consequence of evil karma, but of what use is a sex organ [in the purgatories]? There can be no hope for sexual intercourse in Avīci, the great purgatory. Thus the eighth faculty is definitely the faculty of indifference, because it is associated with the seventh and eighth consciousnesses. Just as in the realm of ultimate pleasure the comforting of mind is called “pleasure,” and there is no faculty of delight, in places of ultimate suffering, the vexation of mind is called “suffering,” and there is no faculty of sorrow. Therefore the three [faculties] mentioned [in the *Yogācārabhūmi*] are doubtless sorrow, delight, and pleasure.

Other sources say that [beings in the purgatories] have pleasure as efflux [of former karma], but you must understand that this is a concession [to other schools], or it refers to situations where feelings are mixed. [Beings in the purgatories] have no pleasure as retribution, and [these places] are therefore called “pure suffering.”

However, as for the holy teachings saying that the feeling of discomfort associated with thought is called the “faculty of sorrow,”

that means “in many cases,” or else, it is a concession and does not really contradict our position. Also, the [earlier statements of the] *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* that say, “As soon as retribution begins in the beings born in the purgatories, there is retribution that generates sorrow,” and that say, “Those in the purgatories have the sorrow of applied and sustained thought, as do some animals and hungry ghosts,” are also concessions.

Also, as for the faculty of suffering associated with mental consciousness, it resembles the sorrow of other [realms of suffering], and therefore we may roughly speak of it as sorrow. Alternately, we can call it “sorrow” because, although categorized as the faculty of suffering, it injures body and mind, just as we also call the approaches [to trance states] “pleasure,” because, although the faculty of delight, it benefits body and mind. This is the interpretation of such works as the *Vyākhyāpana Śāstra*. However, it is certain that in the stage prior to arrival [at the first trance state,] there is no faculty of pleasure, because [the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*] says that there are only eleven faculties [at that stage].

Consequently, you should realize that the feeling of grief in the area of *manas*, in places where feeling is of unadulterated suffering, is also categorized as suffering. This feeling is distinguished under many topics in the holy teachings, but these will not be pursued here for fear of prolixity.

9. Simultaneity of the Three Feelings

There is an interpretation that the three feelings [pleasure, suffering, and neither] are not simultaneously present in the six [sense] consciousnesses, because they are mutually contradictory when evolving in relation to external objects. Mental consciousness associated with the [first] five has the same object that they have, and if the five are associated with the three feelings, then so is mental consciousness. This violates reasoning, and therefore [the six consciousnesses] must not be associated [with the three feelings simultaneously].

When the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* and other texts say that store consciousness at a single instant occurs together with the

three feelings associated with the [six] evolving consciousnesses, they mean during a plurality of instants, just as the expression “one mind” does not refer to a single generation and extinction. Thus there is no contradiction.

There is an interpretation [by Dharmapāla] that the three feelings can be simultaneously present in the six [sense] consciousnesses, because it is possible for agreeable, disagreeable, and neutral objects to be experienced simultaneously, and because thought does not necessarily have to experience the same object as the [other] five. It generates a single feeling when it is fixed on a definite object [perceived by one of the five senses], but when not fixed it generates indifference. Consequently, the three feelings can occur simultaneously in the six consciousnesses.

When one has reached the state of freedom, [the six consciousnesses] are [associated with] pleasure, delight, and indifference only, because Buddhas have eliminated everything that is sorrowful and full of suffering.

10. Universal Mental Activities and Those with Specific Objects

We have briefly explained the six groups of mental activities, but now we must speak in some detail of their specific characteristics. What are the characteristics of the first two groups?

FIRST, UNIVERSAL MENTAL ACTIVITIES, CONTACT, ETC.

NEXT, THOSE WITH SPECIFIC OBJECTS; THAT IS, DESIRE,

RESOLVE, MEMORY, *SAMĀDHI*, AND DISCERNMENT,

WHOSE OBJECTS ARE NOT THE SAME.

28a The Treatise says, among the six groups of mental activities, FIRST, the five UNIVERSAL [mental activities], CONTACT, ETC., are as discussed earlier at length. How should we understand their characteristics? Through the fixed means of knowledge of teachings and reason.

As for teachings, a scripture says, “Visual consciousness arises with eyes and material objects as its conditions, and the union of

these three is called 'contact' (*sparsā*). Along with contact are feeling, conceptualization (*saṃjñā*), volition," etc. Consequently, these four, contact, etc., are universal mental activities. Another scripture says, "If the faculty has not deteriorated and objects appear, and attention properly occurs, then it can produce consciousness." Another text also says, "If there is attention directed toward [an object], then there is perception [of the object]. If there is perception, there will be attention. Thus these two are always united," etc. Consequently, attention is also universal. Many scriptures prove this.

As for reason, for the arising of consciousness there must be a union of the three [organ, object, and consciousness]. That definitely produces contact. Contact must be present, because without it, mind and mental activities do not unite to contact an object. Attention directs mind to its object, and without it, there is no mind. Feeling experiences an object that is agreeable, disagreeable, or neutral, and it makes mind feel joy, distaste, or indifference, because mind is never present without one of these feelings. Conceptualization establishes the particulars of the object, because if mind arises without conceptualization, it is unable to grasp the particulars. Volition makes mind perceive the characteristics of proper causes [of good, etc.] and creates good [actions], etc. Volition must be present, because mind does not occur in the absence [of good, etc.]. Through these logical proofs, you must know that these five dharmas, contact, etc., are universal, because they are necessary for mind to occur. The reason other [mental activities] are not universals will be discussed later.

11. Mental Activities with Specific Objects

NEXT [are the mental activities] WITH SPECIFIC OBJECTS, i.e., those from DESIRE (*chanda*) through DISCERNMENT (*prajñā*). Their OBJECTS ARE NOT [always] THE SAME, for the most part. They are next to the first of the six groups [in the "Thirty Verses"].

What is DESIRE (*chanda*)? Desire has as its nature a wish for a pleasing object, and its activity is that of supporting effort. There

is one interpretation that “pleasing” means “a delightful object,” because a wish exists when one desires to see, hear, etc., some delightful thing. Why is it not desire when one wishes to be apart from a detestable thing and not associated with it? Desire seeks only the time of nonunion or separation, which is, itself, delightful, but it is not desire for something detestable. Therefore an object that is detestable or neither delightful nor detestable is never desired, and there is no desire if a delightful object is not wished for.

There is another interpretation that “pleasing” refers to things one wishes for, because one wishes for either union with the delightful or separation from the detestable. There is never desire for a neutral thing, nor is there desire when the pleasing or detestable object is not wished for.

28b There is a third interpretation that “pleasing” means an object one wishes to examine, because when one desires to examine and investigate everything, there is a wish. If one does not desire to examine, due to the power of the cause or object, and simply perceives the object spontaneously, there is no desire at all.

Reason thus leads to the conclusion that desire is not a universal [mental activity]. There is an interpretation [by the Sarvāstivādins] that mind and mental activities grasp objects as a result of the power of a wish for the object, and therefore a scripture says that desire is the root of all dharmas [and therefore universal]. However, this cannot be the case, because mind, etc., grasps objects because of attention [and not desire]. Various holy teachings say that when attention is present, it produces consciousness, and no source says that desire generates mind and mental activities. The scriptures also say craving is the foundation of all dharmas, but how can it generate mind and mental activities? Therefore when it is said that desire is the root of all dharmas, it means “all actions produced by desire.” Or, it means that good desires produce proper efforts and aids in the accomplishment of all good things. That is why the present treatise says that the activity [of desire] is the support of effort.

What is RESOLVE? Its nature is that of correct ascertainment with regard to an object that is definite [and beyond doubt], and its activity is that of not allowing the object to be doubted. That is, through the power of false or correct teachings, reasoning, or experience, one is certain and correctly ascertains the object in question. As a consequence, other conditions are unable to change one's mind. Therefore resolve is wholly absent if the object is indefinite, and it is likewise absent if the mind is uncertain. Consequently, resolve is not categorized as a universal.

There is the opinion that if, when the mind [and mental activities] grasp their own objects, there is no obstacle, then they are provided with resolve. That is incorrect. Why? Because it is all dharmas that cannot obstruct, and it is mind [and mental activities] that are not obstructed. It is the organ and attention that prevail in the generation [of mind]. If they prevail as a result of resolve, this will subsequently require other [conditions] and that will result in an infinite regress.

What is MEMORY (*smṛti*)? Its nature is that of causing mind to record clearly and not forget an object that has been experienced, and its activity is that of supporting *samādhi*, because it steadily holds an experienced object and prevents its loss, thus inducing *samādhi*. There is no memory of something not already experienced, nor does memory occur if that which is experienced is not clearly recorded. Therefore memory cannot be included among the universals. There is an opinion that when mind arises, it must be accompanied by memory, because it is the cause for a subsequent recollection. This argument is unreasonable, because it cannot be that something like faith or delusion existed previously [as a cause]. Prior mind and mental activities, or the power of conceptualization, suffice to be the later cause of recollection.

What is *SAMĀDHI*? Its nature is that of causing mind to be absorbed in attention on a contemplated object and not become distracted, and its activity is that of supporting knowledge. When contemplating the virtues, defects, both, or neither [of an object], *samādhi* causes the mind to be absorbed and prevents its distraction.

28c

Supported by it, knowledge that is certain is born. The words “absorbed in attention” show that [mind] dwells where it wishes to dwell, not just on one object. Otherwise, there would be no uniform maintenance of attention on the path of insight when one contemplates various truths in a sequence, with differing objects. If the mind is in a state where it is not fixed in attention on the object, there is no *samādhi*, and therefore it is not included among the universal mental activities.

There is an opinion that even then, [when mind is abstracted,] there is *samādhi*, except that its characteristics are subtle and obscure. [People] claiming this should speak honestly and straightforwardly! If *samādhi* is a universal because it makes mind, etc., unite with and be directed to an object, that is not reasonable, because that is the function of contact. If it is claimed that *samādhi* makes the mind remain unchanged for the space of an instant, and for that reason is universal, that is also unreasonable, because the mind itself does not change objects during an instant. If it is claimed that it is universal because it grasps an object, this is also unreasonable, because it is attention that does that.

There is another opinion that *samādhi* is in essence mind itself, because a scripture says that [*samādhi*] is mental training, or mind united with an object. But that is not a convincing proof. It says that in the sense that *samādhi* unifies the mind and causes it to unite with an object. *Samādhi*, included among the faculties (*indriya*), powers (*bala*), aspects of awakening (*bodhyaṅga*), and aspects of the path (*mārgāṅga*), etc., is not mind, just as memory, discernment, etc., are not mind.

What is DISCERNMENT? Its nature is discriminating an object that is being inspected, and its activity is that of eliminating doubt, because discernment seeks certainty when inspecting something that is meritorious, defective, both, or neither. Since discernment does not exist when one is not inspecting an object, or when the mind is deluded and obtuse, it is not included among the universals.

There is an opinion that even then, discernment exists, except that its characteristics are subtle and obscure. We ask, how

do you know that, foolish man? [He replies,] the *Abhidharma* says that it is a universal. [We reply,] various schools do not agree on this. How can they be relied on as reliable testimonies? The scriptures speak of only five—contact, etc.—as universals. When you speak of ten, that is not scripture, and you ought not to be so obstinate. The five [mental activities] such as desire are not [the five of] contact, etc., and therefore are not universal, just as faith, craving, etc., are not.

12. Relationship among the Five with Specific Objects

There is an interpretation [by Sthiramati] that all five [with specific objects] assist each other, and when one exists, the other four must also exist. Another interpretation disagrees, because the *Yogācārabhūmi* [*Śāstra*] says that of the four “alls” [exists at all times, etc.] the last two are missing. It also says that the five [mental activities] arise directed on four kinds of objects, and these objects and the five mental activities do not necessarily occur simultaneously.

It should be said that sometimes only one of the five occurs. That is, only desire when there is something pleasing; only determined resolve when there is something definite; only recollection or memory when there is a past event; only focused attention when there is something being inspected. When deluded, obtuse people try to overcome distraction, even though they focus their attention, they are still unable to investigate and discriminate. Everyone in the world knows that they possess *samādhi* but not discernment.

There is a small amount [of scattered discernment] in the state of added effort (*prayoga-avasthā*), consisting of what has been heard and reflected on, and for that reason it is said that *samādhi* has a contemplated object as its object. Alternately, this is said with respect to many cases; for instance, when the celestials who are oblivious in their play (*kriḍāpradūṣika-deva*) may focus their attention on an object and arouse craving or antipathy, they may have *samādhi* but not discernment. There are numerous examples like this. Another alternative is that investigation only arises with regard to something being inspected; i.e., when the mind is not

29a focused but darts about in distraction, one investigates and seeks in a distracted manner [and there is no *samādhi*].

Sometimes, two [mental activities] may occur; i.e., for instance, desire and resolve occur with regard to an object that is pleasing and definite. Or, desire and memory occur with regard to pleasing objects that were experienced in the past. We can continue like this until we come to *samādhi* and discernment, which occur with regard to something being inspected. Thus they combine to make ten pairs.

Sometimes, three may occur [simultaneously]; i.e., desire, resolve, and memory, when the object is pleasing, definite, and occurred in the past. We can continue like this until we come to memory, *samādhi*, and discernment, when the object being inspected occurred in the past, thus combining to make ten triads.

Sometimes, four occur together; i.e., the first four, when the object is pleasant, definite, occurred in the past, and is being inspected. And we continue thus until we come to the last four [resolve, memory, *samādhi*, and discernment], when the object is definite, occurred in the past, and is being inspected. Altogether, there are five groups of four.

Sometimes, all five occur together; i.e., all five occur together when the object is pleasant, definite, occurred in the past, and is being inspected. Thus the five [with specific objects] arise in relation to the four [characteristics of the object] to combine, generally and specifically, to make thirty-one cases.

Sometimes, none of the five occurs in a certain state of mind, when the four kinds of objects are not present, during a sudden sinking of the mind, and in the store consciousness. There are a number of examples. These [five] may or may not occur in the seventh and eighth consciousnesses, depending on the state [of development], as explained earlier [in the discussion of the store consciousness]. They may be associated with the sixth, mental consciousness, whatever the stage of development, aside from the question of whether or not there has been a transmutation of the support.

According to one interpretation, the [first] five consciousnesses are without all five [with specific objects], because there is no

desire for an object that is already acquired [in the act of perception]; not being capable of decision, they cannot have resolve; they have no memory because they always grasp a new object; they do not focus attention because it is their nature to be distracted and unstable; and they have no discernment because they are incapable of investigation and speculation.

According to another interpretation [by Dharmapāla], the five mental activities may accompany the five consciousnesses, for the following reasons: even though there is no strong desire for the object [in the five consciousnesses], there is still a weak fondness for the object. Even though there is no strong determination toward the object, there is a weak impression of the object. Even though there is no clear and distinct recollection of the substance of a previously experienced object, there is a weak memory of its species. Even though there is no attending and binding mind to an object, there is a weak focusing of attention. In order to counter the notion that [the five consciousnesses] are concentrated in *samādhi*, it is said that they are by nature distracted and unstable, but this does not mean that they cannot be in *samādhi* [but distracted]. Therefore they may be associated with *samādhi*. Finally, even though they are incapable of investigation and speculation concerning an object, they are capable of a weak discrimination. Consequently, the holy teachings say that the paranormal powers of vision and hearing are of the nature of knowledge associated with visual and auditory consciousness. This applies to the other three [consciousnesses] as well, so there is no error [in conceding that the five consciousnesses] are capable of discernment.

These five [activities with specific objects] may not exist prior to the stage of freedom, but once mastery is acquired, they definitely exist. The reason for this is that desire that enjoys contemplating objects does not decrease; resolve that judges objects never decreases; also, the five consciousnesses of a Buddha have as perceptual objects the three time periods [past, future, and present], Tathāgatas do not have minds that are not in *samādhi*, and the five consciousnesses [of a Buddha] possess the discernment required to perform their tasks.

13. Mental Activities with Specific Objects and Their Feelings

291 With what feelings are the five mental activities with specific objects (*aniyata*) associated? One idea is that desire is associated with three feelings, excluding feelings of sorrow (*daurmanasya*) and suffering (*duḥkha*), because the two objects [causing these two feelings] are unpleasant [and thus undesirable]. The remaining four are associated with four [feelings], excluding only the feeling of suffering, because the five [sense] consciousnesses are devoid of judgement, resolve, etc.

According to another interpretation, all [five mental activities] are associated with the five feelings. A treatise says that the faculty of sorrow exists in the thought of supreme dharmas, because in seeking their realization, there is sorrow [in not acquiring them] and longing [for them]. In places of the unadulterated feeling of suffering, [beings] seek liberation, because *manas* possesses the faculty of suffering, as explained earlier. A treatise says that craving and thirst are associated with sorrow and suffering, because both craving and thirst must be associated with desire.

Since the faculty of suffering is associated with mental consciousness, what is the error if the four mental activities, resolve, etc., accompany suffering? Also, as discussed earlier, the [first] five consciousnesses possess the four [activities] of subtle judgement, etc. Therefore [the five mental activities with specific objects] desire, etc., are associated with the five feelings. These five [feelings] should also be investigated from the standpoint of such things as their [moral] natures, realm [where they are found], whether one is a learner, post-learner, etc., in accordance with reason.

14. Good Mental Activities

We have explained universal mental activities and those with specific objects. What are the characteristics of the good mental activities? The verses [of Vasubandhu] say,

FAITH, CONSCIENCE, SENSE OF SHAME,

THE THREE ROOTS [OF GOOD], NONCRAVING, ETC.,

VIGOR, SERENITY, VIGILANCE, INDIFFERENCE, AND
HARMLESSNESS ARE THE GOOD.

The Treatise says that only those associated with a good mind are called “good” mental activities, that is, these fixed eleven consisting of faith, conscience, etc.

What is FAITH (*śraddhā*)? Its nature is that of the purification of mind, which is a profound acquiescence toward and joyful desire for realities, virtues, and abilities. Its activity is that of counteracting faithlessness and enjoying the good.

However, there are, in detail, three aspects of faith. The first is faith in realities, because it is a profound faith in, and acquiescence toward, dharmas that are real things or principles. The second is faith in virtues, because it is a profound faith in, and delight in, the truly pure virtues of the Three Treasures. The third is faith in abilities, because it is a profound faith that one has the ability to obtain, and produce a desire for, mundane and supramundane good [dharmas] respectively. Consequently, it counters faithlessness, and that mind [with faith] desires to realize and cultivate mundane and supramundane good [dharmas]. “Acquiescence” means “resolve,” which is the cause of faith. “Joyful desire” means “longing,” the fruit of faith.

[It is asked,] can you say with certainty what are the distinct characteristics of faith? [We reply,] have we not just defined its nature as purification of mind? [Again, a question,] we still do not completely understand what is meant by “purification of mind.” If purity is identical with mind, then [faith] ought not be a mental activity [but rather mind itself]. If faith causes the mind to be pure, [shameful,] etc., then what is the difference between faith and other mental activities such as shame? The same difficulty arises if [faith] is a pure dharma associated with mind.

29c

[We reply,] its nature is that of purifying. It can purify mind [and mental activities]. We speak of purifying the mind because mind is the predominant matter, just as a water-purifying jewel purifies turbulent water. Although conscience and others are good, they do not have the characteristic of purifying. [Faith] has the

characteristic of purification; hence, we do not get it mixed up [with other mental activities].

Also, each of the defiled dharmas has its own characteristic. It is only faithlessness that is itself soiled and then also soils mind and mental activities, just as something that is extremely dirty soils itself and then others. Faith is truly opposite to that, and that is why purification is its characteristic.

Some say that faith is characterized by fond enjoyment, but if that were true, it would have all three [moral] natures [and would not be simply good]. It would then be essentially the same as desire. Also, it would not have as its object [the two truths of] suffering (*duḥkha*) and its cause (*samudaya*).

There is another theory that faith is characterized by conformity. Again, if that were true, it would possess all three [moral] natures and not differ from resolve and desire. If it is conformity to judgment, that is the same as resolve, and if it is conformity to the pleasing, it is the same as desire. Apart from these two, there is no other conformity. Thus you should know that faith is purification of mind.

What is CONSCIENCE (*hrī*)? Its nature is that of revering and respecting the good through the power of oneself and the Dharma. Its activity is that of countering a lack of conscience and ending evil conduct. One's self-respect and respect for the Dharma increases and one reveres and respects the good and is ashamed of evil; one counters lack of conscience and puts an end to evil conduct.

What is SENSE OF SHAME (*apatrāpya*)? Its nature is that of despising and resisting evil because of the power of worldly opinion, and its activity is that of countering shamelessness and ending evil conduct. As fear of the world's blame increases, one despises and resists evil and is ashamed of offending, one counters shamelessness, and one ends all evil conduct.

Shame for offenses is the common characteristic of these two [i.e., conscience and sense of shame], and for that reason the holy teachings suggest that shame is their common essence. If it is maintained that shame is the specific characteristic of these two, there

must be no substantial difference between conscience and sense of shame. That being so, these two dharmas would surely not be associated, because feeling, conceptualization, etc., are not the same [but are associated]. If it is maintained that the difference is established on the basis of self [as basis for conscience] and other [as basis for shame], they must not really exist, and that contradicts holy teaching. If it is conceded that they are real but originate separately [in sequence], this contradicts the [Yogācārabhūmi] Śāstra, which says that ten [good mental activities] are found in all good minds.

[It is replied,] if veneration [of the good] and contempt [for the bad] are the specific characteristics of these two, their objects must be different, in which case they cannot occur simultaneously. You are as mistaken as we are, so why blame us alone? [We reply,] who says the two dharmas have different objects? [They ask,] in that case, what is your answer? [We reply,] when mind is good, whatever may be its object, there is [at that very moment] veneration of good and contempt for evil. For that reason, both conscience and shame are found [together] in all good minds, regardless of the object. [They ask,] did we not say the same thing? [We reply,] no, what you said was that conscience and shame are substantially the same, so how can you object to our former points? When the holy teachings speak of the importance of self and others, by “self,” they mean oneself and the Dharma, while “others” mean the rest of the world. An alternative explanation is that venerating the good refers to benefitting oneself, and despising evil refers to harming oneself [by others].

30a

NONCRAVING, ETC. means “[noncraving,] nonhatred, and nondelusion” (*alobha, adveṣa, amoha*). These three are called “roots” because they are predominant in the production of good, and because they are immediate antidotes to the three roots of nongood. What is noncraving? Its nature is that of nonattachment to the three realms of existence and their causes, and its activity is that of countering craving and promoting the good. What is NONHATRED (*adveṣa*)? Its nature is that of nonhatred toward [the three kinds of] suffering and its causes. Its activity is that of countering

ill-will and promoting the good. When a good mind occurs, whatever its object, there is neither attachment for nor hatred toward existence, etc. It is not necessary to have these, existence, etc., as objects, even though one is considering them, in the same way that conscience and shame are established in the consideration of good and evil. Therefore these two [i.e., noncraving and nonhatred] are found in all good minds.

What is nondelusion (*amoha*)? Its nature is that of clearly apprehending both principles and events, and its activity is that of countering delusion and promoting the good. According to one interpretation, nondelusion is by nature discernment, because the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* says that its substance is that of certitude [derived] from retribution, teaching, evidence, and knowledge. These are discernment born of innate [discernment], hearing, thought, and cultivation, respectively, all of which are certitude by nature. Even though [nondelusion] is discernment, it is distinguished in order to illustrate how the category of “good” has a special power, in the same way that among the passions [wrong] views [are a kind of discernment].

According to another interpretation, nondelusion is not discernment but has a nature of its own, because it directly opposes ignorance (*avidyā*), and, like noncraving and nonhatred, it is categorized as a root of goodness. The [*Yogācārabhūmi*] *Śāstra* says that the great compassion (*mahā-karuṇā*) is categorized as nonhatred and nondelusion, not as one of the faculties (*indriya*). If nondelusion is by nature discernment, then the great compassion, like the powers, etc., would be categorized as a faculty, like discernment, etc. Also, if nondelusion has no separate nature of its own, it must not really exist, just as nonharming, etc., do not, but that would contradict the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*, which says that among the eleven good [mental activities] three exist only conventionally, while the remaining eight really exist.

Now, when the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* says that [nondelusion] is in essence discernment, it is expressing its self-nature in terms of cause and effect, just as it expresses the essence of faith in terms

of [its cause] acquiescence and [its effect] enjoyment. The principle here must be the same.

Craving, hatred, and delusion that are associated with the six [sense] consciousnesses are categorized as true passions, and they are predominant in the generation of evil; therefore they are established as the roots of nongood. Their elimination necessarily results from both common and special antidotes. The only common antidote is good discernment, while the special ones are the three roots [of good]. Consequently, nondelusion (*amoha*) must exist separately.

VIGOR (*vīrya*) is diligence. Its nature is that of courage and resoluteness in the cultivation of good and the elimination of evil, and its activity is that of acting as an antidote to indolence and the fulfillment of the good. The term “courage” signifies “unchecked progress,” which excludes defiled dharmas. “Resoluteness” signifies “purity” and excludes pure, indeterminate dharmas. These terms show that diligence is categorized as by nature good only.

The varieties [of vigor] are, in summary, five: donning armor, intensified practice, not being depressed, not retrogressing, and not being satisfied. They are expressed in scriptures as respectively being inclined, being diligent, being courageous, being determined, and not abandoning the good yoke.

Their distinctions are as follows: the first one consists of the preliminary arousing of the thought [of enlightenment]; the second one consists of unchecked progress [to higher levels]; and the last three are the three grades of effort in one’s practice. Or, they may be distinguished as follows: the first is the preliminary arousing of the thought [of enlightenment]; the second refers to length [of practice]; the third refers to uninterrupted [effort]; the fourth refers to the great amount [of effort]; and the fifth refers to completion [of effort]. Or, they may be distinguished as the five paths, consisting of equipment (*saṃbhāra-mārga*), added effort (*prayoga-mārga*), insight (*darśana-mārga*), cultivation (*bhāvanā-mārga*), and realization (*niṣṭhā-mārga*), because those in the ultimate path of the two vehicles delight in great awakening, and those in the ultimate path of Buddhahood delight in benefitting others and

30b

making them happy. Or, they may correspond to the two kinds of preparation [i.e., distant and proximate], noninterruption, liberation, and unchecked progress.

SERENITY (*praśrabdhi*) means “lightness and contentment.” Its nature is that of keeping the gross and heavy far away, regulating and comforting body and mind, and making them fit [for meditation]. Its activity is that of counteracting torpor and transforming the support [which is body and mind]. It subdues and banishes [the grossness and heaviness] that obstruct *samādhi* and changes the support into one of serenity and pleasantness.

VIGILANCE (*apramāda*) is vigor and the three roots [of good]. Its nature is that of avoiding that which is to be eliminated and cultivating that which is to be cultivated. Its activity is that of counteracting negligence (*pramāda*) and realizing and fulfilling all mundane and supramundane good things. It consists of four dharmas. It is called VIGILANCE because it is the ability to eliminate that which is to be eliminated and to cultivate that which is to be cultivated. It has no substance of its own, because it has no characteristics that differ [from vigor and the three roots], and because it has no function that differs from the four powers in avoiding evil and cultivating good.

Even though faith, conscience, etc., also have this ability, in comparison [with vigilance] the power of those four is slight. They are not roots [of good], nor do they universally stimulate [the good]. Therefore they are not the support [of vigilance]. [Question:] Are avoidance and cultivation not the characteristic and function [of vigilance]? [Reply:] What is the difference between avoidance and cultivation on the one hand and vigor and the three roots on the other? [Reply:] These four require vigilance in order to function. [We reply:] Then [vigilance] itself requires something else in order to function, thus resulting in an infinite regress. [They reply:] Vigor is merely the universal stimulation [of good dharmas], and the roots are merely their support. How can you say that they have the function of avoidance and cultivation? [We ask:] What is the character of the functions of avoidance and cultivation? If they

serve as supports, that is [the function of] noncraving, etc. If you say that it is that of universally stimulating [good dharmas], that is [the function of] vigor. [Thus] preventing evil and promoting good is the activity of these four dharmas.

That which prevents distraction must be *samādhi*. How does [vigilance] differ from contact which causes experience of an object? Memory must prevent forgetting. If we investigate this manner in such a way, no function of vigilance can be found apart from [the four dharmas of] noncraving, etc. Therefore it is certain that vigilance has no separate substance.

What is INDIFFERENCE (*upekṣā*)? Its nature is that of vigor and the three roots that cause the mind to rest in equality, uprightness, and effortlessness. Its activity is that of countering agitation and calming [the mind]. That is, the four dharmas [of vigor and the three roots] cause the mind to be far removed from the obstacles of agitation, etc., and to rest quietly in equality, uprightness, and effortlessness, which is called INDIFFERENCE. These three forms of indifference [equality, etc.] indicate differences of primary, middle, and later stages. Impurities are eliminated at first through vigilance, and later indifference causes the mind to rest calmly. It has no separate substance, because, like vigilance, it has no character or function apart from these four dharmas. This is because it is those dharmas that bring about calm, and it is mind, etc., that are calmed.

What is NONHARMING (*avihiṃsā*)? Its nature is that of not causing injury to living beings, as well as nonhatred. Its activity is that of acting as an antidote to harming [others] and being compassionate and sympathetic. In short, nonhatred is conventionally referred to as nonharming because there is no injury to sentient beings. Nonhatred is opposed to the hatred that ends the lives of beings, and noninjury opposes the harm that injures beings. Nonhatred extends happiness, while nonharming banishes suffering. This is the difference between their apparent characteristics.

In fact, nonhatred has no substance of its own, while nonharming is conventionally established by virtue of being an aspect [of nonhatred]. The two are distinguished in order to show

30c

the two characteristics of compassion and sympathy, because benefitting sentient beings and making them happy are the essentials of the two [characteristics].

According to one interpretation, nonharming is not the same as nonhatred and has its own substance, which is goodness. [We ask,] what is the characteristic [of nonharming]? [They reply,] noninjury. [We reply,] nonhatred is also noninjury, so how can it have a nature of its own? Noninjury of sentient beings, sympathy and compassion, and goodness are all nonhatred.

The word AND [in the “Thirty Verses”] indicates that there are other mental activities besides the eleven [specified in the verses]; i.e., good mental activities such as delight and loathing. They are not specifically mentioned because even though they have various names with distinct meanings, they are no different in substance [from those specified]. [For instance,] delight is an aspect of nonhatred associated with desire, because it is nonirritation with regard to a pleasing object. The same is true of nonresentment, nonirritation, nonvexation, nonjealousy, etc., because each opposes an aspect of hatred. Disgust or loathing is an aspect of noncraving associated with discernment, because there is no defiled attachment to disgusting objects. You should realize that the same is true of nonavarice, nonpride, etc., because they each oppose an aspect of noncraving. Nonhypocrisy, nondeception, and nonflattery are aspects of noncraving and nondelusion, because [as aspects of noncraving and nondelusion] they are accordingly opposed to aspects of craving and delusion.

There is an interpretation that nonhypocrisy is merely an aspect of nondelusion, because nowhere is it claimed that hypocrisy is an aspect of craving. [There are several interpretations of nonpride:] it is an aspect of faith, because there is no self-pride concerning something that is doubtful. It is an aspect of indifference, because there is no arrogance or pride when the mind is equitable. It is an aspect of conscience, because one is not proud with regard to something that is respected.

As for nondoubt, there are also several interpretations. It is included in faith, because one has no doubt about what is believed.

It is included in perfect resolve, because that which is certain does not generate doubt. It is included in perfect discernment, because there is no doubt about that which is perfectly viewed.

The substance of nondistractedness is included in perfect *samādhi*, and perfect views and perfect knowing are both good discernment. Nonforgetting is the same as perfect memory. Repentance, drowsiness, and applied and sustained thought are either defiled or nondefiled, like contact, desire, etc., and have no opposites.

Why are the good [mental activities] that oppose defiled ones listed separately [in the list of eleven], while others are not? They are listed because they have special characteristics and functions. This is not so of the other good [mental activities], it is not necessary. Also, due to the predominance of defiled dharmas found throughout the [first] six consciousnesses, these good dharmas are therefore listed separately to oppose them.

Pride, etc., and anger, etc., are only associated with mental consciousness. Although the same is true of harming, still, since it occurs frequently and causes injury to others, blocking the predominant cause of the supreme vehicle, which is compassion, its opposite is established to indicate its extreme, excessive nature. Loss of memory, distraction, and imperfect knowing are opposites of mental activities with specific objects [not good ones]; therefore they are not mentioned among the good [mental activities]. 31a

Defiled and pure [mental activities] are opposed, so why are there fewer pure ones than defiled ones? Because the pure ones are strong, while the defiled ones are weak, and the few are a match for the many. Also, in explaining principles, it is said that the many [pure dharmas] are of the same substance, while [defiled dharmas] that delude the feelings are multiplied according to their characteristics. Therefore there is no need for criticizing [the number of] defiled and pure [dharmas].

Three of these eleven exist in name only; i.e., vigilance, indifference, and nonharming, as mentioned earlier. The other eight really exist, because they have distinct natures and functions.

15. Universality

There is an interpretation that of the eleven good mental activities, four are found in all good minds, because vigor and the three roots [of good] fill the category of “good.” This is not necessarily true of the remaining seven. The reasons are as follows: when one is uncertain when examining some thing or principle, there is no faith. Conscience and sense of shame are the same species but differ depending on the support and the situation, so when one occurs, the other does not. Serenity exists only at the point where the passions are eliminated by the mundane path. Vigilance and indifference arise only at the time of the undefiled path. Nonharming only exists when there is compassion for sentient beings.

The [*Yogācārabhūmi*] *Śāstra* locates the eleven in six states: faith is associated with the state of certainty; when the defilements have ended, conscience and sense of shame occur with reference to oneself and others [respectively]; vigor and the three roots exist in one of good disposition; serenity occurs on the mundane path; indifference and vigilance occur on the supramundane path; nonharming exists when one attends to beings.

According to another interpretation, that explanation is still not reasonable, because if faith does not occur when one examines events or principles, and one is uncertain, this is not a good [state], in the same way that defiled mind, etc., [is not good since] pure faith is absent. Also, conscience and the sense of shame have the same objects, though their species and supports differ, and both are found in all good minds, as explained earlier. And, if serenity does not occur on the supramundane path, then this aspect of awakening (*bodhyaṅga*) is not pure. If there is no indifference and vigilance on the mundane path, then there will be no calm in combatting evil and cultivating the good, and one could not subdue agitation and carelessness. The impure, good mind has four dharmas [consisting of vigor and the three roots of good], because [the mundane path,] like the supramundane path, must have these two dharmas. Also, when the mind is good, one does not harm beings, because it opposes dharmas that harm. Therefore there is nonharming.

When the [*Yogācārabhūmi*] *Śāstra* speaks of eleven mental activities occurring in six states, it is speaking of their increased activity in relation to such-and-such states. Therefore the points we criticized are incorrect. It should be said that of the eleven dharmas—faith, etc.—ten are found in all good minds. Serenity is not universal, because one must be in *samādhi* for it to occur, and a composed body and mind are absent in other states. The *Viniścayasamgrahaṇi* says, “Ten good mental activities are found in all good minds, whether or not there is a stage of *samādhi*, but in the stage of *samādhi*, there is an increase of serenity in the mind.” There is an interpretation that “stage of *samādhi*” applies also to preparatory stages to *samādhi*, because there is a subtle composure even there. Hence the realm of desire also has serenity in it. If this is not so, there is a contradiction with the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* statement that the eleven good mental activities are found in all stages. 31b

Another interpretation claims that serenity is found only in *samādhi*, because composure is the result of the nourishing features of *samādhi*. The [*Yogācārabhūmi*] *Śāstra* says that mind and mental activities associated with the realm of desire are called “non-*samādhi*,” because they are devoid of serenity. When it says that the eleven good mental activities are found in all stages, it refers to the three stages of applied and sustained thought, etc., [which are beyond the realm of desire].

We have already explained that the eleven kinds [of good mental activities] may or may not exist in the seventh and eighth consciousnesses depending on the state [of development]. They all exist in the sixth consciousness in a state of *samādhi*, except that if *samādhi* does not occur, there is no serenity. According to one interpretation, there are only ten associated with the [first] five consciousnesses, because they are by nature distracted and unstable and devoid of serenity. According to another interpretation, serenity is associated with these five consciousnesses, because when they are good, as a result of [the presence of] *samādhi*, composure exists, and also because serenity is

necessarily associated with the knowledge of perfecting the work [which is associated with *samādhī*].

16. The Five Feelings

With what feelings are the eleven good mental activities associated? Ten are associated with the five feelings. The one [i.e., serenity] is eliminated by sorrow and suffering, because of the feeling of distress and lack of composure.

17. Mental Activities with Specific Objects

All eleven [good mental activities] can be associated with the [five] mental activities with specific objects, because there is no contradiction between faith, etc., and desire, etc.

18. Moral Species

These eleven mental activities are exclusively good.

19. Realms

Serenity does not exist in the realm of desire. The remaining ten are found in all three realms.

20. Stages of Development

[All eleven are found] in all three stages of learner, [post-learner, and neither learner nor post-learner].

21. The Three Eliminations

They are not eliminated by [the path of] insight. The *Yogācāra-bhūmi Śāstra* says that six faculties (*indriya*), faith, etc., are eliminated only by [the path of] cultivation, not by [the path of] insight.

Other topics and distinctions should be considered according to the same principles.

22. The Passions

We have now explained the good mental activities. What are the characteristics of the mental activities that are passions? [Vasubandhu's] verses say,

THE PASSIONS ARE CRAVING, HATRED,
DELUSION, PRIDE, DOUBT, AND WRONG VIEWS.

The Treatise says that these six are called PASSIONS because these six natures, craving, etc., constitute the fundamental passions.

What is CRAVING (*rāga*)? Its nature is that of defiled attachment to existence [in the three realms] and its causes, and its activity is that of obstructing noncraving and generating suffering, because it is through the power of thirst (*tṛṣṇā*) that the aggregates that are grasped are born.

What is HATRED (*dveṣa*)? Its nature is that of hatred for suffering and its causes, and its activity is that of obstructing nonhatred, causing discomfort, and supporting evil conduct, because hatred necessarily causes affliction to body and mind and generates evil conduct, which is by nature bad.

What is DELUSION (*moha*)? Its nature is that of confusion and dullness of wit concerning principles and events, and its activity is that of obstructing nondelusion and acting as the support of all defilements, because as a result of ignorance, one generates the passions and secondary passions of doubt, false views, craving, etc., karma, and all the defiled dharmas that instigate subsequent rebirth.

What is PRIDE (*māna*)? Its nature is that of presumption that one is above all others, and its activity is that of obstructing nonpride and producing suffering, because if there is pride, one is not humble concerning merits and those who possess them, and the result is an endless turning of the wheel of death and rebirth and the experience of all suffering. There are seven or nine kinds of pride, produced in relation to the three grades [of inferior, equal, and superior], to oneself, and to merits. All are eliminated in the 31c

path of insight and the path of cultivation. Since self-pride can occur even among the saints (*ārya*), it is not incorrect to say that pride exists even there.

What is DOUBT (*vicikitsā*)? Its nature is that of lack of certainty regarding truths and principles, and its activity is that of obstructing certainty and those things considered to be good, because for him who lacks certainty, the good is not generated. There is an interpretation that the essence of this doubt is discernment, because uncertain judgment is doubt, because the meaning of “doubt” is derived from [the prefix *vi* plus the root *mati* | i.e., *vimati*, which means “doubt”], and *mati* [meaning “discernment”] is the same as *prajñā* [which also means “discernment” or “wisdom”].

According to another interpretation, doubt has its own substance, because it causes uncertainty of discernment and is not the same as discernment. The *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says that of the six passions, [wrong] views exist only conventionally, since they are aspects of discernment, but all the others really exist, because they have natures. If you hold that discernment is doubt because of [the derivation from] *vi* plus *mati*, then knowing must be consciousness, because of *vi* plus *jñāna* | i.e., *jñāna* means “knowing,” and *vi-jñāna*, or *vi* plus *jñāna*, means “consciousness”]. However, the meaning of a verbal root changes because of the prefix, which is why doubt is not discernment by nature.

What are WRONG VIEWS (*kudṛṣṭi*)? They have as their nature defiled discernment, consisting of perverted judgement concerning truths and principles, and their activity is that of obstructing correct views and bringing on suffering. He who has wrong views often experiences suffering. There are five modes of wrong views.

The first is the view of [the aggregates as] a person; i.e., the five grasped aggregates are held to be a self and what belongs to a self (*ātma-ātmīya*), and this view acts as a support for all [wrong] views. There are twenty or sixty-five different forms of wrong views categorized as originating in discrimination.

The second [mode of wrong views] is that of extreme views. Its activity is that of adopting views of eternalism and annihilationism vis-à-vis [the view of the aggregates as a self] and obstructing the

practice of the Middle Way and emancipation. Different one-sided views comprise extreme views: clinging to the past, with four theories of general eternalism and four of partial eternalism; and clinging to the future, with sixteen views of conscious existence, eight views of absence of consciousness, and eight theories concerning neither consciousness nor unconsciousness, etc., all categorized as originating in discrimination.

The third is heterodox views, i.e., criticism of cause, effect, karma, and realities; with the exception of four views, they include all other false attachments, just as the name “dominant condition” refers to all conditions [except cause, condition as object, and simultaneous condition].

Of the different extremist views that comprise heterodox views is one that clings to the past, with two theories of noncausality, four deceptive and confusing theories concerning the limits, etc. [of the world], and deathlessness. Also, there is speculation about the future, including five theories about *nirvāṇa* in the present. Or there is speculation about a master of the world (*īśvara*), Śakra, Brahma, and others of this sort being eternal and unchanging. Or there is speculation that the master of the universe is the cause of all things, or the perverse speculation about false liberation, or the false position that that which is not the path is the path. All these are categorized as heterodox views.

The fourth is clinging to [heterodox] views (*dṛṣṭi-parāmarśa*). It consists of holding that various [heterodox] views and the aggregates that support them are the most excellent and that they will secure purity. Its activity is that of supporting conflict.

The fifth wrong view is that of clinging to mere personal morality and ritualism (*śīla-vrata-parāmarśa*). It is the notion that to follow various views, personal morality, and purity, along with the aggregates that support these, is the most excellent and secures purity. Its activity is that of acting as a support for fruitless activity and suffering. 32a

However, there are sources that say that attachment to something as most excellent is called “clinging to [heterodox] views,” and clinging to what secures purity is called “clinging to personal

morality.” However, these sources are vague and nonspecific, or else what they say is a concession. Otherwise, why is it said that taking noncessation as cessation and that which is not the path as the path are wrong views and not the two kinds of clinging?

23. Innate Passions and Those Arising from Discrimination

Among the ten passions, six are both innate and originate from discrimination, because they occur both spontaneously and through discrimination. Doubt and the [above] last three kinds of false views originate only from discrimination, because they must only originate from the power of bad companions and false teachings, as well as one’s own reflections. When it is said that attachment to extreme views originates both ways, one interpretation has it that only [the view of] annihilation [originates both ways]. The characteristics of the view of eternalism are gross and only arise through the power of bad companions, etc. The *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* and other texts ask, “Which extreme views are innate? That which is included in the view of annihilation. He who practices the Contemplation of the Truths (*satya-abhisamaya*) fears, ‘Right now, where is my self?’ Therefore when birds, animals, etc., encounter something that threatens them, they fear for the annihilation of the self and are terrified.”

According to another interpretation, [the *Yogācārabhūmi*] is speaking with reference to coarse characteristics [of this view]. Actually, the view of eternalism is also innate. That is, birds, animals, etc., grasp the self as eternally existing and busily accumulate goods for a long time. Therefore the *Vikhyāpana Śāstra* and other works say that whether the aggregates that are grasped are grasped as annihilated or speculated about as being eternal, these [views] may be either innate or generated by discrimination.

24. Interrelationship of the Ten Passions

Which of the ten passions are associated? How many? Craving certainly does not occur simultaneously with hatred and doubt,

because the two objects of desire and loathing are certainly not the same, and because there is no defiled attachment to objects that are uncertain. Craving may be associated with pride and wrong views. The beloved object and the detested object are not the same, and for that reason it is said that the two do not occur simultaneously. That which is defiled [i.e., the body] and that in which one takes pride [i.e., the self] can be the same, and therefore [self-love and self-pride] can be associated. And, since all the objects of the five views are lovable, there is no problem in the association of craving and the views.

Hatred may occur simultaneously with pride and doubt. The hated object and the object of pride are not the same, and therefore it is said that hatred is not associated with pride. But it is possible for the despised object and the hated object to be identical, so they can be associated. When one is at first uncertain, one does not hate that [object], so hatred is not associated with doubt. Having thought for awhile and being still uncertain, one experiences great anger, and therefore [uncertainty and hatred] can be associated. Doubt may or may not be associated with hatred, depending on the favorability or unfavorability [of the object]. Hatred is certainly not associated with the two false views, because one does not hate what is grasped as being superior. Hatred may be associated with the remaining three false views. One does not arouse hatred toward the pleasing aggregates viewed as eternal, and therefore there is no association between hatred and false views. However, one does arouse hatred toward the painful aggregates viewed as eternal, and therefore hatred can be associated with the false views. Hatred may also occur or not occur simultaneously with the false views if the aggregates are seen as impermanent and subject to annihilation. Hatred may or may not occur simultaneously with wrong views depending on whether one denies bad things or good things respectively.

Pride in an object is certain, and doubt is uncertain; therefore pride and doubt are not associated. It is possible for pride to occur with the five false views (*dr̥ṣṭi*), because their modes of activity

32b

and development are not mutually contradictory. However, [pride] certainly does not occur simultaneously with the view of annihilation, because when one holds to the annihilation of the self, one does not despise [others] or esteem [the self]. The same is true with regard to pride in association with a part of the view of the self and wrong views.

Doubt is uncertainty and is contradictory to [false] views; therefore doubt and the views are certainly not associated. The five [false] views themselves are certainly not associated, because a plurality of discernments does not occur simultaneously in a single mind. Delusion is definitely associated with the [other] nine kinds [of passions], because all passions are necessarily born as a result of delusion.

25. The Passions and Consciousnesses

With what consciousnesses are the ten passions associated? None at all occur in the store consciousness; *manas* has four; all ten occur in mental consciousness; and only three, craving, hatred, and delusion, are found associated with the [first] five consciousnesses, because they are lacking in discrimination and because pride, etc., originate in calculation.

26. The Passions and the Feelings

With what feelings are the ten passions associated? Three, craving, hatred, and delusion, being innate or [resulting from] discrimination, can be associated with five feelings, because craving in the presence of a disagreeable object occurs with sorrow and suffering, and because hatred confronted with an agreeable object occurs with delight and happiness.

There is an interpretation that pride that is innate or [generated by] discrimination may be associated with four unpainful feelings, because the esteem of something painful and vile is associated with sorrow. Another interpretation is that innate [pride] also occurs simultaneously with suffering, because, as previously explained, *manas* has the feeling of suffering. Pride, etc., [generated by] discrimination are nonexistent in destinies

of unadulterated suffering, because there are no false teachers or teachings, etc., there. Moreover, [beings there] do not perform karma that leads to evil destinies, because [that karma] can only occur as a result of discrimination.

Doubt and the last three views can be associated with four feelings, because doubt in [the realm of] desire concerning the existence of suffering [and the other three holy truths] is associated with the feeling of delight. The two false views [that mere rites and personal morality are efficacious] may be associated with sorrow when their objects are views associated with sorrow.

According to one interpretation, the two innate views of the existence of a self and the reality of extremes are only associated with feelings of delight, happiness, and indifference, because they are not associated with the [first] five consciousnesses and are nondetermined only. When arising from discrimination, these two views may be associated with four feelings, because grasping the aggregates associated with suffering as “me” and “mine” and adopting views of eternalism and annihilationism [with respect to suffering and happiness respectively] entails sorrow.

Another interpretation is that these two wrong views, if innate, are also associated with the feeling of suffering, because in places of unadulterated suffering, the aggregates connected with extreme suffering are associated with suffering. The [*Yogācāra-bhūmi*] *Śāstra* says, “All innate passions can be present with the three feelings.” A full explanation has been given earlier. The rest [concerning the two wrong views] is as explained earlier.

All of these explanations are based on truth. From the standpoint of coarse characteristics, craving, pride, and the four false views are associated with happiness, joy, and indifference; hatred occurs only in association with feelings of suffering, sorrow, and indifference; delusion can be associated with all five feelings; false views and doubt are associated with four, excluding suffering.

Happiness associated with craving and delusion is found throughout the lower four stages [i.e., the realm of desire and the first three trance states]. Happiness associated with the other seven

32c

[passions|is found in the three [trance states] but not in the realm of desire. Doubt and self-reliant delusion in the realm of desire [are associated with] only sorrow and indifference. Those occurring simultaneously with the others should be understood according to the same principles.

27. Passions and Mental Activities with Specific Objects

How are these associated with mental activities with specific objects? Craving, hatred, delusion, and pride may occur with all five, because when they are directed toward an object, they can be associated with *samādhī*. Doubt and the five false views may each be associated with four feelings. Doubt excludes resolve, because it is indecision. The [false] views do not coexist with discernment, because [false views|are not different from discernment |and more than one discernment does not exist simultaneously].

28. The Ten Passions and the Moral Natures

In what [moral] natures are the ten passions included? Hatred is exclusively not good, because it injures oneself and others. The other nine are both. In the upper two realms [of form and formlessness], they are only indeterminate, because they are subdued by *samādhī*. If they originate in discrimination in the realm of desire, they are categorized as only not good, because they provoke evil conduct. If innate and provoking evil conduct, they are also considered to be not good, because they injure oneself and others. The others [that do not injure] are indeterminate, because they are subtle, do not obstruct good, and do not severely injure oneself and others. You should know that the innate view of “self” and “mine” and extreme views are indeterminate only, because they do not provoke evil acts and, though occurring often, do not obstruct the good.

29. The Ten Passions and the Three Realms

In what realms are the ten passions included? Hatred exists only in [the realm of] desire, while the others are found in all three

realms. For one born in a lower stage who has not abandoned the impurities of the lower stage, the passions of the upper stages do not manifest themselves. It is necessary to obtain the basic *samādhi* of those [upper] stages in order for the passions of those stages to appear. Even though those on the various impure paths are unable to subdue passions originating in discrimination, or subtle, innate passions, they are able to subdue and get rid of innate, coarse passions and gradually realize the basic *samādhi* of the upper [two] stages. Those [coarse, innate] passions are only delusions about events, and [these passions] occur with respect to the exterior world. Being coarse, distracted, and unstable, they directly obstruct *samādhi*. Having obtained *samādhi* of that stage, all passions originating from discrimination and those that are innate in that stage can appear.

When one is born in an upper stage, all innate passions and those originating in discrimination of the lower stage can appear, because one in the intermediate existence (*antarā-bhava*) of the fourth trance state is born in the purgatories if he rejects liberation, and when the time arrives for someone in the upper stages to be reborn in a lower stage, he generates an innate love for the lower world that nourishes rebirth. When it is said that one born in the upper stages does not generate [passion] of the lower, it means for the most part, or it is a concession [to non-Mahayana teachings].

Passions of the lower stages also have as objects an upper stage. The *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* and other texts say that craving connected with the realm of desire seeks birth in upper stages in order to savor the delights of the *samādhi* of the upper stages. Also, they say that since hatred hates and is jealous of cessation and the path [leading to cessation], one also must be jealous of the stages of detachment from the realm of desire. Therefore, generally taking karmic predispositions (*saṃskāras*) as a self and what belongs to a self, views of annihilation, eternity, and pride can all have the upper stages as objects. It is equally obvious that the remaining five [passions] have as objects the upper stages.

Some sources say that craving, hatred, pride, etc., do not take the upper stages as objects, but this is said concerning their gross characteristics, or they refer to [those passions] as having a special object [which is one's own body and mind]. We do not see mundane attachment to dharmas of other stages as a self, etc., and extreme views necessarily occur on the basis of the view of self.

33a Passions of the upper stages also have the lower stages as objects, because it is said that one who is born in the upper stages esteems his virtues as superior to those below and despises those below. Also, the general attachment to karmic predispositions (*saṃskāras*) as “me” and “mine,” views of annihilation and eternity, and love [of possessions] all have the lower stages as objects. Doubt and the last three wrong views should be considered in like manner. Yet it is said that passions related to the upper stages do not have the lower stages as objects, but this means in most cases, or it concerns those [passions] that have special objects [such as the view of a self].

30. The Three Classes of Learners

How are these ten passions related to the classes of learners, [post-learners, and neither learners nor post-learners]? [They are related to the] neither learner nor post-learner (*naivaśaikṣānāśaikṣā*), because the other [two classes] are exclusively good [and reject the passions].

31. The Three Eliminations

How are the ten passions to be eliminated? They are not not to be eliminated (*aheya*), because that [not to be eliminated] is nondefiled. Those generated by discrimination are to be eliminated only by the path of insight, because they are gross and easily eliminated. If they are innate, they are eliminated by the path of cultivation because these are subtle and difficult to eliminate. The ten that are eliminated by insight and associated with reality are all eliminated suddenly, because the path of insight into reality has as its object the [four] truths as a whole.

However, delusion concerning the characteristics of the truths may be general or specific. It is general in that the ten [passions] are all delusions concerning the four truths, because suffering and its cause are their cause and support, while cessation and the path are occasions of fear for the passions. It is specific in that it arises from specific kinds of delusion concerning the characteristics of the four truths. Two [passions] are only delusion about the truth of suffering; eight concern all four [truths]; the two views about the self and extreme views only occur where the result [i.e., suffering] is concerned, because of specific delusion about emptiness and no self associated with the truth of suffering. Doubt and the three false views [concerning self, extreme views, and wrong views derived from heterodox teachings] are directly deluded about the principle of suffering. The two false views [i.e., clinging to others' false views and belief in the efficacy of mere rites and personal morality] are attachments to the above three false views, personal morality, and their supporting aggregates as superior and purifying. They generate craving, hatred, and pride according to whether they are related to views about oneself, the views of others, and the aggregates to which they are related.

Associated ignorance has the same delusions as the nine [passions] with which it is associated. Special ignorance is directly deluded about the principle of suffering. Doubt and false views are directly deluded about the origin [of suffering], etc., and the two kinds of clinging, craving, etc., should be understood in the same way as suffering. However, hatred can also be directly deluded about cessation and the path, because it generates hatred and jealousy out of fear for them. These are the delusions concerning the [four] truths, direct or indirect, in their gross characteristics.

To speak in more detail, craving, hatred, and pride born together with the [first] three wrong views and doubt involve delusion [vis-à-vis the four truths] in accordance with the situation. Even though the two innate wrong views and desire, pride, and ignorance associated with them are delusions about the truth of suffering, since they are subtle and difficult to eliminate, they are eliminated by the path of cultivation. Hatred and the others,

desire, etc., generate delusion about specific matters and do not conflict with the contemplation of the truths, and therefore they are eliminated by [the path of] cultivation.

Even though the various passions all have a seen part [as an object], the substance on which they rest may or may not exist, so they are called accordingly “passions with a [supporting] causal basis” (*savastuka*) and “passions without a [supporting] causal basis” (*avastuka*). Even though their direct objects are all impure, their supporting substances may be pure, so [passions] are called “passions with impure [objects]” or “passions with pure [objects].” When a passion has as its object the stage one is in, its seen part is similar to its [supporting] substance and is called “[a passion] having as its object a thing generated by speculation.” When [a passion] has as its object the [holy] truths of cessation and path, as well as a stage other than that in which one is, it is called “[a passion] having as its object a name generated by speculation,” because the seen part is not similar to its substance. Other topics are to be considered according to the same principles.

32. Secondary Passions

33b We have discussed the characteristics of the six fundamental passions. What are the characteristics of the secondary passions? The verses [of Vasubandhu] say,

THE SECONDARY PASSIONS ARE ANGER,
 HOSTILITY, DISSIMULATION, VEXATION, ENVY, AVARICE,
 DECEIT, HYPOCRISY, WITH HARMFULNESS AND VANITY,
 LACK OF CONSCIENCE AND SHAMELESSNESS,
 AGITATION AND TORPOR,
 UNBELIEF AND INDOLENCE,
 NEGLIGENCE AND FORGETFULNESS,
 DISTRACTION AND INCORRECT KNOWING.

The Treatise says that the secondary passions are so called because they are only certain states of the passions and of the nature of modalities [of the passions]. There are three kinds of these twenty;

i.e., the ten [beginning with] anger are called “small secondary passions” because each originates separately; the two [consisting of] lack of conscience [and shamelessness] are called “medium secondary passions” because they are found in all bad [minds]; and the eight [beginning with] agitation are called “large secondary passions,” because they are found in all defiled minds.

What is ANGER (*krodha*)? Its nature is that of irritation toward a present object that does not benefit one. Its activity is that of obstructing nonanger and taking up the cudgel; that is, because someone who is angry often displays physical actions that are violent and bad. Its substance is part of hatred, because apart from hatred there is no character or function of anger.

What is HOSTILITY (*upanāha*)? Its nature is that of nonabandonment of a strong resentment resulting from hatred for a prior wrong upon which one dwells. Its activity is that of obstructing nonhostility and intensifying vexation, because he who has strong hostility cannot be forgiving, and his vexation is always intensified. Its substance also is part of hatred, because apart from hatred there is no separate character or function of hostility.

What is DISSIMULATION (*mrakṣa*)? Its nature is that of hiding one’s own offenses out of fear of losing benefits or reputation. Its activity is that of obstructing nondissimulation and [intensifying] the vexation of remorse; i.e., because he who dissimulates about offenses necessarily is vexed with remorse later and is not at peace.

There is an interpretation that this dissimulation is categorized as a part of delusion, because a treatise only says that it is a part of delusion, because one dissimulates about one’s own offenses from not dreading the suffering to come. There is an interpretation that this dissimulation is a part of craving and delusion, because one dissimulates about one’s own offenses also out of fear of losing benefits and reputation. The treatise only speaks of it as being a part of delusion in accordance with its gross and obvious [characteristics], in the same way that it says that agitation is part of craving. However, it says that agitation is found in all defiled minds, and it cannot be taken as only a part of craving.

What is VEXATION (*pradāsa*)? Its nature is that of burning rage toward a previous [object of] anger and hostility. Its activity is that of obstructing nonvexation and biting; that is, because whether the antipathetic object is past or present, the mind is enraged and one utters many violent, malicious [words], and these fierce, vile, coarse words bite others [like serpents]. This is also in substance a part of hatred, because apart from hatred there is no separate character or function of vexation.

33c What is ENVY (*īrśya*)? Its nature is that of jealousy from seeking after one's own fame and fortune and not enduring another's success. Its activity is that of obstructing nonenvy and causing dissatisfaction and grief; that is, because he who is envious and jealous hears of or sees another's success and is deeply dissatisfied and sorrowful, and he finds no peace. This also in substance is a part of hatred, because apart from hatred there is no separate character or function of envy.

What is AVARICE (*mātsarya*)? Its nature is that of addiction to goods or the Dharma and being incapable of graciously letting go of them, to hiding them and being stingy. Its activity is that of obstructing nonavarice and causing pettiness and acquisitiveness; that is, because the mind of the person who is avaricious and stingy is hard and stingy, he amasses goods and the Dharma and cannot let go of them. This is in substance a part of craving and thirst, because apart from craving and thirst there is no separate character or function of avarice.

What is DECEIT (*śāṭhya*)? Its nature is that of the deception of pretending to possess merits in order to gain benefits or reputation. Its activity is that of obstructing nondeceit and causing a wrong life; that is, because the mind of the deceitful one harbors strange schemes, he often exhibits a wrong life. This is in substance a part of craving and delusion, because apart from craving and delusion there is no separate character or function of deceit.

What is HYPOCRISY (*māyā*)? Its nature is that of crookedness by assuming other forms of behavior in order to deceive others. Its activity is that of obstructing nondeception and admonishment;

that is, because in order to deceive others the hypocrite schemes and devises expedients, deviously taking advantage of the situation in order to seize the other's intentions or to hide his own faults, and he does not heed the admonishments of teachers and friends. This also is in substance a part of craving and delusion, because apart from craving and delusion there is no separate character or function of hypocrisy.

What is HARMFULNESS (*vihimsā*)? Its nature is that of a mind that is uncompassionate and unkind toward sentient beings and injures them. Its activity is that of obstructing harmlessness and causing injury; that is, the harmer injures others. This also is in substance a part of hatred, because apart from hatred there is no separate character or function of harmfulness. The difference in characteristics of hatred and harmlessness should be explained in conformity with the good [mental characteristics that are their opposites].

What is VANITY (*mada*)? Its nature is that of intoxicated haughtiness that profoundly generates a defiled attachment to one's own grand affairs. Its activity is that of obstructing nonvanity and acting as a support for defilement; that is, a vain person produces and nourishes all defiled dharmas. This also is in substance a part of craving and thirst, because apart from craving there is no separate character or function of vanity.

What is LACK OF CONSCIENCE (*ahrikya*)? Its nature is that of disregard for oneself and the Dharma and a disrespectful resistance to the virtuous and good. Its activity is that of obstructing conscience and nourishing evil; that is, because he who has no regard for himself or the Dharma has a disrespectful resistance to the virtuous and good and is unashamed of his transgressions, obstructs shame, and produces and nourishes various evil actions.

What is SHAMELESSNESS (*anapatrāpya*)? Its nature is that of disregarding the world and exalting violence and evil. Its activity is that of obstructing shame and producing and nourishing evil actions; that is, because he who is without regard for the world exalts violence and evil and is unashamed of his transgressions, obstructs shame, and produces and nourishes various evil actions.

Being unashamed of transgressions is the common characteristic of both [lack of conscience and shamelessness], and for that reason, the holy teachings conventionally speak of it as their substance. If you take shamelessness as the distinct characteristic of the two, then there must be no difference in the substance of the two. Consequently, these two dharmas must not occur simultaneously, because feeling, conceptualization, etc., do not have this meaning [of identity of characteristics]. If it is held that the difference between the two is based on self [as the basis for lack of conscience] and others [as the basis for lack of shame], then they must not really exist, which contradicts the holy teachings. If you concede that these two are real but arise separately, you contradict the [Yogācārabhūmi] which says that both are found in all evil minds.

34a

When minds are not good, whatever the object may be, all have a disregard for good and exalt evil. Therefore these two dharmas are both found [simultaneously] in all evil minds. The objects are not different, and there is no error of separate occurrences. However, as for various holy teachings speaking of “disregarding self and others,” this is because “self and Dharma” is referred to as “self” and “world” is called “other.” Or, it may be because here, disregarding good and exalting evil is called “self and others” with reference to benefit or harm to oneself. As for the treatise also saying that [lack of conscience and shamelessness] are part of craving, etc., it is a mode of those passions but not the same nature.

What is AGITATION (*auddhatya*)? Its nature is that of preventing the mind from being calm with respect to objects. Its activity is that of obstructing indifference and [meditative] tranquility (*samatha*). There is an interpretation that agitation is categorized as a part of craving, because a treatise says that it is part of craving and because it is born as a result of the memory of former happy events. Another interpretation is that agitation is not just categorized as craving, because a treatise says that agitation is found in all defiled minds. Also, the characteristic of agitation is lack of calm, because it is said that [lack of calm] is characterized as the common characteristic of all passions, and agitation has no

distinct characteristic apart from this [common characteristic of lack of calm]. Even though it is conventionally established on the basis of [its presence in] all the passions, it increases with the presence of craving and is said [for that reason] to be a part of craving.

According to one interpretation, agitation has a separate nature of its own and is found in all defiled minds, like unfaith, etc. [The texts] do not say that its substance is not real because it is a part of another, because it must not be that unbelief, etc. [which are also parts of another] are also conventionally existent. Also, as for the treatises also saying that it exists conventionally, like drowsiness, etc., this is said with reference to the characteristics of another [dharma]. The specific characteristic of agitation is said to be excitement, because it causes dharmas that are born with it to be uncalm. If it does not have this separate characteristic apart from the passions, [the texts] must not say specifically that it obstructs [meditative] tranquility. Therefore, noncalm is not its specific characteristic.

What is *TORPOR* (*styāna*)? Its nature is that of causing the mind to be unfit with regard to an object. Its activity is that of obstructing serenity and [meditative] insight (*vipaśyanā*). According to one interpretation, torpor is categorized as a part of delusion, because a treatise only says that it is a part of delusion and because torpid dullness and sinking heaviness are characteristics of delusion.

According to another interpretation, torpor is not just categorized as a part of delusion; that is, because unfitness is the characteristic of torpor, and all passions are unfitness. Apart from this [unfitness], there is no separate characteristic of torpor. Even though it is conventionally established on the basis [of its presence] in all passions, it increases as a characteristic of delusion and so [the texts] only speak of it as a part of delusion.

There is an interpretation that torpor has its own separate self-nature. Even though it is called a part of delusion and is a mode [of the latter], like unfaith, etc., it is not categorized as delusion. It is said to exist conventionally in accordance with its dependence on the characteristic of another [i.e., delusion], and, like drowsiness,

etc., it is a really existing nature. The specific characteristic of torpor is obscurity and dullness, because it causes dharmas that are born with it to be unfit. If, apart from the passions, there is no
 34b specific characteristic of torpor, [the texts] should not specifically say that it obstructs [meditative] insight. Therefore unfitness is not the specific characteristic of this [torpor].

The difference in characteristics [of torpor] and delusion is that the characteristic of delusion is a deluded blindness concerning an object, and it directly obstructs nondelusion and is not obscurity and dullness. The characteristic of torpor is obscurity and dullness concerning an object, and it directly obscures serenity and is not deluded blindness.

What is UNBELIEF (*aśraddhā*)? Its nature is that of mental foulness as nonacquiescence, nonenjoyment, and nondesire concerning realities, virtues, and abilities. Its activity is that of obstructing pure belief and acting as the support of laziness, because the faithless one is often indolent. The three characteristics of unbelief oppose belief, you should know. However, each of the defiled dharmas has a specific characteristic. Only the specific characteristic of this unbelief is pollution that then pollutes the other mind and mental activities, just as an extremely polluted thing pollutes itself and then pollutes others. For this reason, it is said that its nature is that of mental foulness. As a consequence of unbelief, one does not acquiesce in, enjoy, or desire realities, virtues, and abilities, [but] they are not its separately existing natures. If there is false acquiescence, enjoyment, and desire with regard to other matters, those are the causes and results [of unbelief], not its own nature.

What is INDOLENCE (*kausīdya*)? Its nature is that of reluctance to cultivate the good and eliminate evil. Its activity is that of obstructing vigor and increasing defilement; that is, because the indolent person nourishes defilement. He who is diligent with respect to defiled dharmas is also called “indolent” because he shuts out good dharmas. Because the person who is diligent with respect to indeterminate dharmas neither progresses nor regresses concerning the good, it is [in this case] desire or resolve, and not a

separately existing nature, just as acquiescence in, enjoyment of, and desire for the indeterminate is neither pure nor defiled, neither faith nor faithlessness.

What is NEGLIGENCE (*pramāda*)? Its nature is that of laxity in being incapable of guarding against defilement and cultivating purity. Its activity is that of obstructing vigilance and acting as the support of increasing evil and injuring the good. That is, it is generally called “negligence” because, as a result of indolence, along with craving, hatred, and delusion, one is unable to guard against defilement and cultivate the good dharmas. It does not have a separate substance. Although conceit, doubt, etc., also have this ability, compared with those four, their power is very weak in obstructing the three roots of good and the universally stimulating dharma [of vigor]. The characteristic of this [negligence] can be investigated in the same way as vigilance.

What is FORGETFULNESS (*muṣītasmti*)? Its nature is that of an inability to remember clearly various objects [that one experiences]. Its activity is that of obstructing correct memory and acting as a support for distraction; that is, he who is forgetful is mentally distracted (*citta-vikṣipta*). There is an interpretation that forgetfulness is a part of memory, because it is said that it is memory associated with the passions. According to another interpretation, forgetfulness is a part of delusion, because the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says that it is part of delusion. Delusion causes loss of memory and is therefore called “forgetfulness.” There is an interpretation that it is categorized as a part of both [memory and delusion] because the former two passages [from treatises] are ambiguous and terse and the [*Yogācārabhūmi*] *Śāstra* says later that this [forgetfulness] is found in all defiled minds.

What is DISTRACTION (*vikṣepa*)? Its nature is that of causing the mind to wander from its objects. Its activity is that of obstructing correct *samādhi* and acting as the support for bad discernment (*kuprajñā*); that is, because the distracted person exhibits bad discernment. There is an interpretation that distraction is a part of delusion, because the *Yogācārabhūmi* [*Śāstra*] says that it is part

34c

of delusion. According to another interpretation, distraction is categorized as craving, hatred, and delusion, because the *Abhidharma-samuccaya* and other texts say that it is tripartite. When it is said that it is a part of delusion, it is because it is found in all defiled minds. It is said that craving, hatred, and delusion surpass other dharmas in causing the mind to wander, and therefore they are said to be distraction.

There is an interpretation that distraction has its own separate substance. When it is said that it is tripartite, these are its modes (*niṣyanda*), just as lack of conscience, etc., is [according to some]. It is not categorized as the same as that, and it is called “conventionally existing” according to its characteristics. The specific characteristic of distraction is precisely turbulence, because it causes dharmas born with it to wander. If it has no separate substance of its own apart from those three [craving, etc.], it should not be specifically said that it obstructs *samādhī*. What, then is the difference in function between agitation and distraction? The former causes a change in understanding, and the latter causes a change in the object. Even though understanding and objects do not change during an instant, change occurs during a continuity [of moments]. When the mind is defiled, there must be, from instant to instant, a changing understanding or object, due to the power of agitation and distraction. Or, when restrained by memory, etc., it remains fixed for awhile, like a tethered donkey. Therefore, agitation and distraction are both found in all defiled minds.

What is INCORRECT KNOWING (*asaṃprajanya*)? Its nature is that of mistaken understanding of the object being considered. Its activity is that of obstructing correct knowing and being an offense (*āpatti*), because the one with incorrect knowing offends much.

There is an interpretation that incorrect knowing is categorized as a part of discernment, because it is said that it is discernment associated with the passions. According to another interpretation, incorrect knowing is categorized as part of delusion, because the [*Yogācārabhūmi*] *Śāstra* speaks of it as a part of delusion. It is called “incorrect knowing” because it causes knowing to be incorrect.

According to another interpretation, incorrect knowing is categorized as a part of both [discernment and delusion] because the former two passages are ambiguous and terse [in explaining], and the [Yogācārabhūmi] Śāstra later speaks of it as being found in all defiled minds.

The words AND and WITH [in the “Thirty Verses”] indicate that there are not just twenty secondary passions, because the *Kṣudravastuka* and other texts speak of many kinds of craving, etc., that are secondary passions. The name “secondary passions” also includes the [six primary] passions, because they are by nature the modes of prior passions. Other defiled dharmas of the same species as the passions are always called “secondary passions,” because they are not [technically] categorized as passions. When it is said that there are only twenty secondary passions, it means that they are not [technically] passions but are only defiled and gross. Other defiled dharmas are either states [of these twenty] or their modalities and included in them. You must understand them according to reason in accordance with the difference of species.

33. Conventional and Real

Among these twenty secondary passions, the small ten and three of the large ones conventionally exist. Lack of conscience, shamelessness, unbelief, and indolence doubtlessly really exist, as demonstrated by teachings and reason. Three kinds, agitation, torpor, and distraction, according to one interpretation are conventional and according to another interpretation are real. They should be understood in accordance with previously cited reasoning and teachings.

35a

34. Innate or Resulting from Discrimination

All twenty belong to both [categories of] innate and [resulting from] discrimination, because they occur due to the power of the two [kinds of] passions.

35. Interrelationship

Among these twenty, the small ten definitely do not arise together in their development, because they are mutually contradictory,

due to each being sovereign in its gross and violent mode of activity. The two medium ones occur in all minds that are not good, and all can occur together with small or large [secondary passions] as fitting. The [*Yogācārabhūmi*] *Śāstra* says that the large eight are found in all defiled minds and that it is possible for all to occur with developing small and medium [secondary passions]. In some sources, it is said that six are found in all defiled minds, because when torpor and agitation increase [in prominence], they do not occur together. Other sources say that just five are found in all defiled minds, because torpor, agitation, etc., contradict only good [mental activities].

36. Association with the Eight Consciousnesses

Because these [secondary passions] are defiled only, they do not occur in the eighth [consciousness]. Only the large eight occur in the seventh consciousness. The difference in accepting or rejecting [which may occur with which consciousnesses] should be understood according to the above [reasons]. It is possible for all to occur in the sixth consciousness. The ten small ones, being gross and violent, do not exist in the [first] five consciousnesses, but it is possible for the medium and large ones to exist in the [first] five consciousnesses.

37. The Five Feelings and the Secondary Passions

Consequently, the medium and large [secondary passions] are associated with the five feelings. There is an interpretation that the small ten, excluding three, such as anger, etc., are only associated with three feelings, joy, sorrow, and indifference. Hypocrisy, deceit, and vanity occur with four [feelings], excluding suffering. According to another interpretation, anger, etc., are associated with four [feelings], excluding happiness; three, hypocrisy, deceit, and vanity, occur with [all] five feelings, because, as previously explained, the feeling of suffering exists in the *manas*. The association of characteristics of these [secondary passions] with feelings is as explained in connection with the passions.

This is the true interpretation. If we proceed according to gross characteristics, anger, hostility, vexation, envy, and harmfulness occur with sorrow and indifference; dissimulation and avarice [are associated] with joy and indifference; the remaining three increase happiness. The medium and large [secondary passions] are as in the [above] true interpretation in accordance with their gross [characteristics].

38. Association with Mental Activities with Specific Objects

These twenty may all occur together with the five mental activities with specific objects, because there is no contradiction among them. Even though defiled memory and defiled discernment do not occur with memory and discernment, when they are a part of delusion, they can be associated. Memory also has as an object a present object of a kind that has been previously experienced, and anger also has as an object the instantaneous past. Therefore anger can be associated with memory. When defiled *samādhi* arises, the mind is also turbulent and distracted; therefore there is no error if distraction is associated with *samādhi*.

39. Association with the Passions

The two medium and eight large [secondary passions] occur with the ten passions. The small ones definitely do not occur together with false views and doubt, because [the former] are gross and unstable, while [the latter] are subtle in their judgements. It is possible for the five dharmas of anger, etc., to occur with pride and delusion, but not with craving and ill will, because these are a part of hatred. Avarice occurs with doubt and pride, but not with craving and hatred, because it is part of craving. Vanity is associated with only delusion; it differs from pride because it is part of craving. Dissimulation and deceit occur with hypocrisy, craving, delusion, and pride, because their modes of activity are not contradictory and are parts of craving and delusion.

40. Moral Nature

Seven small and the two medium [secondary passions] are categorized as not good only. Three small and the eight large ones also are undetermined.

41. The Three Realms

35b Seven small and the two medium [secondary passions] belong only to the realm of desire; deceit and hypocrisy belong to the realms of desire and form; the remainder belong to [all] three realms. One born in a lower stage can generate eleven [secondary passions] of a higher [stage], because he who is addicted to the pleasures of *samādhī* generates vanity, deceit, and hypocrisy with regard to others. If born in an upper stage, one generates the last ten of a lower stage, because when occurring with wrong views and thirst, it is possible for them to be generated. There is no reason for someone born in the upper [stages] to generate the minor ten of a lower [stage], because they do not nourish rebirth and do not defame [the truth of] cessation. The two medium and eight large [secondary passions] of the lower stages also take as their objects the upper [stages], because they arise in association with craving, etc., with the upper as an object.

There is an interpretation that the ten small [secondary passions] of a lower [stage] do not have the upper [stages] as objects, because their modes of activity are gross and near and do not grasp the distant. According to another interpretation, envy, etc., can also take the upper [stages] as an object, because one can generate envy, etc., with respect to dharmas of the upper [stages]. The eight large [secondary passions], along with hypocrisy and deceit, of an upper stage can have the lower as an object, because they are associated with pride, etc., which take the lower [as objects], and because Brahma generates hypocrisy and deceit toward disciples of Śākyamuni. Vanity does not have the lower as an object, because they are not its support.

42. Association with Categories of Learners

All twenty [secondary passions] are included [in the category of] neither learner nor post-learner, because the [secondary passions] are defiled only, while the [learners and post-learners] are pure only.

43. Elimination

The last ten [secondary passions] only are eliminated in both [paths of] insight and cultivation, because they arise in association with the two [kinds of] passions [i.e., the innate and those arising from discrimination]. Those eliminated by insight arise with the passions in accordance with delusion about characteristics of the [four] truths, either wholly or in part. Therefore all are found in connection with the four truths, and the directness or indirectness, etc., of delusion about the truths is all as explained concerning the passions.

With regard to the first ten [secondary passions], there is an interpretation that they are eliminated only by cultivation, because their objects are gross things and they are born spontaneously. According to another interpretation, they are eliminated by both insight and cultivation, because they arise through the power of the two kinds of passions [i.e., innate, etc.], and because one may give rise to anger, etc., when encountering the views, etc., of another. Those eliminated by insight all pervade the [entirety of the] four truths in accordance with appropriate objects through the power of general or specific passions. In this matter, there is an opinion that anger, etc., are deludedly born with delusion about the truths only indirectly, not with direct delusion about the truths, because their modes of activity are gross and superficial and do not grasp in a profound manner. According to another interpretation, envy, etc., are also direct delusions concerning the truths, because one arouses envy, etc., regarding cessation and the path. However, the ten starting with anger only have existing things as objects, because they depend on a fundamental substance for birth. Having as an object such things as impurity, etc., can be understood by analogy with the above [discussion of fundamental passions].

44. Indeterminate Mental Activities

35c We have explained the twenty secondary passions. There are four indeterminate mental activities (*aniyata-caitta*). What are their characteristics? The Verses [of Vasubandhu] say,

THE INDETERMINATE MENTAL ACTIVITIES ARE
REMORSE AND SLOTH,
APPLIED THOUGHT AND SUSTAINED THOUGHT,
TWO PAIRS IN TWO WAYS.

The Treatise says, “They are established as indeterminate because remorse, sloth, applied thought, and sustained thought are indeterminate insofar as good, defilement, etc., are concerned, because they are not, like contact, etc., definitely found in [all] minds, and because they are not, like desire, etc., found in all stages.”

REMORSE (*kaukṛtya*) means “wrongdoing.” Its nature is that of a repentance for wrongs one has committed. Its activity is that of obstructing [meditative] tranquility. The name of the cause is conventionally applied to the result, because wrong acts are committed previously and later there is repentance. Remorse for what one has not done previously is also categorized as “wrongdoing,” just as one may repent saying, “Such things that I did not do are my wrongdoing.”

SLOTH (*middha*) is “sleepiness,” and its nature is that of dullness and feebleness that prevents physical freedom. Its activity is that of obstructing contemplation. That is, in a state of sleepiness, the body is not free and the mind is extremely dull and feeble, evolving through one gate [which is mental consciousness]. Being dull, it is excluded from *samādhi*; being feeble, it is distinguished from wakefulness, but in causing the manifestation of sleepiness it is not without substance and function. There is a state of mindlessness that is conventionally given this name, because, like the other hindrances (*nivāraṇa*) and bonds (*paryavasthāna*), it is associated with mind.

There is an interpretation that these two [remorse and sloth] are in substance only delusion, because it is said that they are a

part of the secondary passions and delusion. According to another interpretation, this is incorrect, because they can also be good. It should be said that when these two are defiled they are delusion in substance, and when pure they are nondelusion. The treatise [referred to] says that they are categorized as a part of the secondary passions and delusion because it refers to their defiled aspect.

According to another interpretation, this explanation also does not correspond to reason, because when they are indeterminate, they are by nature neither delusion nor nondelusion. It should be said that remorse is in substance volition and discernment, because it clearly ponders actions performed and makes choices. Sloth synthesizes and uses volition and conceptualization as its substance, because it thinks about numerous dream objects and because both treatises say that it exists relatively. When they are defiled, they are modes of delusion, in the same way that unfaith, etc., are said to be parts of delusion.

There is an interpretation that the reasoning expressed [above] is also incorrect, because the bonds [of remorse and sloth] are not by nature volition, discernment, and conceptualization. It should be said that each of the two has a separate substance, because their modes of activity differ from other mental activities. They are said to exist relatively due to the characteristic of delusion.

APPLIED THOUGHT (*vitarka*) means “seeking.” Its nature is that of causing the mind to evolve hastily in a gross manner with reference to objects of mental discourse (*mano jalpa*). SUSTAINED THOUGHT (*vicāra*) means “investigation.” Its nature is that of causing the mind to evolve in a subtle manner with reference to objects of mental discourse. Both of these have as their activities that of acting as supports for peaceful or nonpeaceful dwelling of physical and mental states. Both use a part of volition and discernment as their substance, because of the difference in species of not profoundly investigating or profoundly investigating the objects of mental discourse. Apart from volition and discernment, no separate substance or species of applied thought and sustained thought can be found.

36a

When [the verses] say TWO PAIRS IN TWO WAYS, there is an interpretation that applied thought and sustained thought are distinguished by the two species of defilement and purity. According to another interpretation, this explanation must not be correct reasoning, because remorse and sloth also have the two [natures] of defilement and purity. It should be said that, like the existence of the previously discussed defiled mental activities, they are of the nature of passions and secondary passions, and each of these [second “two”] has not good and indeterminate [as natures]. Or, each of these have the bonds (*paryavasthāna*) and propensities.

According to another interpretation, that explanation also cannot be reasonable, because these words [“two pairs in two ways”] occur after [the listing of] these four indeterminates. You should say that “two” indicates two kinds of two: one is remorse and sloth, the other is applied thought and sustained thought. These second two kinds of species are different, and therefore the first “two” refers to the second two kinds. These are each of two kinds; that is, defiled and undefiled, because they are unlike the good or defiled [mental activities] that are each of only one kind. Or [the expression] just excludes defilement, and for that reason [Vasubandhu] uses this expression, and because it is said [in the *Yogācārabhūmi*] that they are secondary passions. In order to indicate the meaning of “indeterminate,” [Vasubandhu] says TWO PAIRS IN TWO WAYS, and therefore it is useful to take these words with a sense of their depth.

45. Real or Conventional

Among these four, applied thought and sustained thought definitely exist conventionally, because it is said by the sages that they are the synthesis of volition and discernment. There is an interpretation that remorse and sloth also exist conventionally, because the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says that they exist relatively. According to another interpretation, these two exist as real things, because only the last two kinds [i.e., applied thought and sustained thought] are said to exist conventionally. The words

“exist relatively” are said in accordance with their characteristics of otherness [in being part of delusion], but they do not indicate that the former two are definitely conventionally real. Also, it is similar to the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* saying that even though the internal seeds are real in substance they are of relative existence.

46. Association with the Indeterminates

Among these four, applied thought and sustained thought are definitely not associated, because they are the same in substance and species but they differ in being gross and subtle. Differences among the other three stages are established in accordance with aversion (*vairāgya*) or lack of aversion for applied thought and sustained thought, not on the basis of their existence as seeds or as actualities. Therefore there is no confusion [of stages]. Both may be associated with [remorse and sloth], and these former two are also mutually associated.

47. Association with the Eight Consciousnesses

None of the four is associated with the seventh and eighth consciousnesses. The explanation is as given previously. Remorse and sloth are associated only with the sixth consciousness, because they are not dharmas [associated with the |five| consciousnesses]. There is an interpretation that applied thought and sustained thought are also associated with the |first| five consciousnesses, because the |*Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says that the five consciousnesses have applied thought and sustained thought. It also says that applied thought and sustained thought have seven discriminations; that is, |those things| having characteristics, etc. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya-vyākhyā* repeats that spontaneous discrimination means the five consciousnesses.

There is an interpretation that applied thought and sustained thought are only associated with mental consciousness, because the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says that the dharmas of applied thought and sustained thought, etc., are all uncommon dharmas of mental consciousness. It also says that applied thought and sustained

36b thought are associated with sorrow and joy, and because they have never been said to be associated with happiness and suffering. There is no reason for indifference, which is universal, to be mentioned, but why does [that treatise] not say that [applied and sustained thought] are associated with happiness and suffering? Although there is happiness in the realm of *manas* during the first trance state (*dhyāna*), still it is not separate from joy, and it is generally referred to by the name of “joy.” Although there is suffering in the realm of *manas* in places of unadulterated suffering, still it resembles sorrow and is generally referred to as “sorrow.” Although the [*Yogācārabhūmi*] *Śāstra* says that applied thought and sustained thought have names, etc., and their meanings as objects, the five consciousnesses themselves do not have names, etc., and their meanings as objects. However, when it says that the five consciousnesses have applied thought and sustained thought, it indicates that many [consciousnesses] originate from these [two], not that they are associated.

The expression of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya-vyākhyā*, “spontaneous discrimination refers to the five consciousnesses,” differs from the interpretation of the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*. That [first text] says that spontaneous [discrimination] is the same as the five consciousnesses, while the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says that this [spontaneous discrimination] is applied thought and sustained thought associated with discriminating mental consciousness occurring with the five consciousnesses. Therefore the evidence that these [texts] quote is inconclusive. Consequently, the five consciousnesses definitely do not have applied thought and sustained thought.

48. Association with Five Feelings

There is an interpretation that remorse is associated with sorrow and indifference, because it evolves as painful activity and is found as indeterminate. Sloth occurs with feelings of joy, sorrow, and indifference, because its activity usually evolves as agreeable, disagreeable, or neither. Applied thought and sustained thought are associated with sorrow, joy, indifference, and happiness, because

in the first trance state, *manas* is associated with happiness. There is an interpretation that these four [indeterminate mental activities] also occur with the feeling of suffering, because *manas* is associated with suffering in destinies of unadulterated suffering.

49. Mental Activities with Specific Objects

All four may occur with the five [mental activities] with specific objects, because their modes of activities and objects are not mutually contradictory.

50. Association with Good Mental Activities

Remorse and sloth may only occur with ten good [mental activities], because they exist only in [the realm of] desire and are devoid of serenity. Applied thought and sustained thought may occur with [all] eleven good [mental activities], because in the first trance state, they are associated with serenity.

51. Association with the Passions

Remorse may only be associated with ignorance, because its mode of activity is gross, and craving, etc., are subtle. Sloth, applied thought, and sustained thought are associated with the ten passions, because there is no mutual contradiction in the development of these [indeterminates] and those [passions].

52. Association with Secondary Passions

Remorse may occur with the medium and large secondary passions, but not with the ten beginning with anger, because they are sovereign. Sloth and applied thought and sustained thought may occur with [all] twenty [secondary passions], because in states of sloth, etc., all may generate them.

53. Moral Species

These four all pervade the three natures of good, etc., because one also repents indeterminate actions. There is an interpretation that

the first two [i.e., remorse and sloth] involve only good acquired at birth, because their modes of activity are [respectively] gross and dull. The latter two are also categorized as the good of added effort (*prāyogika*), because applied thought and sustained thought exist in that which is achieved through hearing, etc. There is an interpretation that the first two also involve the good of added effort, because remorse and sloth exist in states of hearing and volition.

The last three are common to the defiled indeterminate and the pure indeterminate; remorse is not defiled because its understanding is gross and violent. Among the four [varieties of] the [category of] indeterminate, remorse is [included in] only the middle two, because its mode of activity is gross and violent and not the fruit of *samādhi*. Sloth is excluded from the fourth [variety of indeterminate], because it is not born of *samādhi*, and a mind born of retribution can acquire it. Applied thought and sustained thought are excluded from the first [variety] because its understanding is very feeble and it is unable to investigate words, meanings, etc.

54. Indeterminate Mental Activities and the Realms

36c Remorse and sloth exist only in [the realm of] desire; applied thought and sustained thought exist in [the realm of] desire and the first trance state, because dharmas of the remaining realms and stages are wonderfully calm. Remorse and sloth must not appear in one born above [in a superior realm], and applied thought and sustained thought of the upper [realms occurs as that of a] lower realm and can generate those of the [upper realms] in a lower one. The applied thought and sustained thought of lower and upper [stages] can have as objects the upper and lower [stages] respectively.

There is an interpretation that remorse and sloth cannot have as an object the upper [stages] because their modes of activity are gross and direct [in the case of remorse] and extremely dull [in the case of sloth]. There is an interpretation that these two also have as an object the upper object, because someone with false views can regret having cultivated *samādhi*, and a dream can in all cases have as an object something already experienced.

55. Indeterminate Mental Activities and Categories of Learners

Remorse excludes post-learners, because they have left desires and are indifferent. Remorse, sloth, applied thought, and sustained thought are all common to the three classes [of learners], because all conditioned (*saṃskṛta*) good dharmas of one who seeks liberation are called “learners,” and because the conditioned good dharmas of one whose learning has culminated are all “post-learners.”

56. Elimination

Remorse and sloth are to be eliminated only by the [paths of] insight and cultivation, because they also originate through the power of wrong views, etc., they are not directly attracted and generated by the pure paths, and, unlike sorrow, they do not deeply seek liberation. If it is to be called “not to be eliminated” (*aheya*) because it has already been eliminated, then the sloth of a post-learner is categorized as “not to be eliminated.”

Even though applied thought and sustained thought are not the true, pure path, still they are able to attract it and be attracted and be born from it; therefore, they are common to both insight and cultivation and categorized as “not to be eliminated.” As for the interpretation that applied thought and sustained thought are not to be eliminated, this is because they are categorized as being only discrimination among the five dharmas, and the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says that they are discrimination.

There is an interpretation that these [latter] two are also categorized as “correct knowledge” (*samyag-jñāna*), because it is said that correct reflection is pure, because it can cause the mind to seek, and because it is said that it causes speech. In the penultimate state, one is unable to have universal knowledge of medicines, illnesses, etc., and must depend on conventional applied thought and sustained thought during [the state of] subsequently acquired knowledge (*prṣṭhalabdha-jñāna*) in order to preach the Dharma to others. It is not like the effortless preaching in the stage of

Buddhahood. Therefore these two varieties [of thought] also pervade [the category of] purity.

Even though it is said that applied thought and sustained thought must be discrimination, it is not said definitely that they belong to only the third [category among the five dharmas], because there is discrimination in subsequently acquired correct knowledge. Other topics [concerning the four indeterminates] can be understood by analogy with the above through the use of reason.

57. Mental Activities and Mind

Do these six kinds of dharmas or mental activities [i.e., good, passions, universal, etc.,] have a separate self-nature apart from mind? Are they distinctions of states of mind? What are the errors of affirming these?

There are errors in affirming both of these [above positions]. If they have self-natures apart from mind, how can the holy teachings say that there is only consciousness? Or how could they say that “mind alone goes a long way,” or that “defilement and purity result from mind,” or that “the person is the six elements”? How can the explanation of the *Mahāyāna Sūtrālaṃkāra* be grasped? A verse [in this text] says,

We affirm that mind appears twofold;
In the same way, it appears as craving, etc.,
Or else it appears as faith, etc.,
And there are no separate defiled or good dharmas.

37a If [on the other hand] they are distinctions of states of mind, how can the holy teachings speak of “associates of mind,” because is not something associated with another nature a nature of its own? Also, how can [the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*] say that “When mind and mental activities are simultaneously born, they are like the sun and the light”? How can we grasp the teaching of the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*, because it says that “mental activities are not the same as mind”? A verse [from the above scripture] says,

The five seed natures [i.e., aggregates] are not
demonstrated;
The distinctions of states [of mind] are an error,
Because there is no distinction of causes and conditions,
And it is a contradiction of the holy teachings.

It should be said that [mental activities] have a separate self-nature apart from mind, but due to the predominance of mind, it is said that there is “consciousness only,” etc. Because mental activities are born through the power of mind, it is said that they “appear similar to that,” but not that they are mind. Also, the terms “consciousness” and “mind” include mental activities, because they are always associated. None of the terms “consciousness only,” etc., or “appears similar to mind” is erroneous.

This [doctrine] is based on relative [truth]. If we resort to ultimate truth, mind and mental activities are neither distinct nor identical. You should know that the same is true of the interrelationships of the [eight] consciousnesses. This is said to be the marvellous principle of true and conventional [truth] in the Mahayana.

58. States of Appearance of the Six Consciousnesses

We have discussed the association of mental activities with the six consciousnesses [i.e., the first five consciousnesses and mental consciousness]. How should we understand their states of appearance? [Vasubandhu’s] Verses say,

SUPPORTED ON THE FUNDAMENTAL CONSCIOUSNESS,
THE FIVE CONSCIOUSNESSES APPEAR IN ACCORDANCE
WITH CONDITIONS,
EITHER TOGETHER OR NOT.
LIKE WAVES SUPPORTED BY THE WATER.
MENTAL CONSCIOUSNESS PERPETUALLY APPEARS
EXCEPT IN THOSE BORN AMONG THE UNCONSCIOUS CELESTIALS
AND IN THE TWO MINDLESS SAMADHIS,
AND IN THOSE WHO ARE [IN STATES OF] SLOTH AND
STUPEFACTION.

The Treatise says that FUNDAMENTAL CONSCIOUSNESS is *ādāna-vijñāna*, because all impure and pure consciousnesses are born from this root. SUPPORTED means that the first six evolving consciousnesses have fundamental consciousness as their common, proximate support. FIVE CONSCIOUSNESSES means that the first five evolving consciousnesses are spoken of in general, because they are similar as species. The words APPEAR IN ACCORDANCE WITH CONDITIONS show that they do not always appear. CONDITIONS are such conditions as attention, organs, objective realm, etc. That is, the five consciousnesses themselves can be present when supported internally by the fundamental consciousness and by conforming to a combination of various conditions such as attention, the five organs, objects [of perception], etc. Consequently, they appear EITHER TOGETHER OR NOT, because, when external conditions combine, they exist suddenly [together] or gradually. LIKE WATER AND WAVES, they are many or few, depending on conditions. The analogy of these dharmas [as water and waves] is extensively discussed in the [*Samdhinirmocana*] *Sūtra*.

59. Mental Consciousness

As a result of the grossness and instability of the modes of activity of the [first] five evolving consciousnesses, sometimes many of the conditions on which they depend are incomplete, and therefore sometimes they appear infrequently and many times they do not appear. Even though the sixth, mental consciousness, is also gross and unstable, there is no time when the conditions upon which it depends are not complete, and [only] as a result of contrary conditions is there a time when it does not appear.

The modes of activity of the seventh and eighth consciousnesses are subtle, and the various conditions on which they depend are at all times present; therefore, there is no condition to block them and cause general inactivity. Also, the five consciousnesses themselves are unable to reflect, only evolving vis-à-vis the external [realm]. Their appearance depends on many conditions, and therefore there are many times when they are interrupted and few times when they are actually active. The sixth consciousness itself is

capable of reflection, evolving vis-à-vis the inner and outer [realms]. It does not depend on many conditions and is always able to appear, except in five states. Therefore there are few times when it is interrupted and many times when it appears. Consequently, [Vasubandhu's verses] do not say that it appears in accordance with conditions. What are the five states [when it is inoperative]? Birth among the unconscious [celestials], etc.

60. The Unconscious Celestials

The UNCONSCIOUS CELESTIALS (*asaṃjñika-deva*) means that they are born in that celestial realm by the power of cultivating *samādhi* and a distaste for gross conceptualization, which interferes with the non-perpetually active mind and mental activities. Extinction of conceptualization is foremost [of characteristics of this existence], and they are [therefore] called “unconscious celestials.” Therefore the six evolving consciousnesses there are all interrupted. There is an interpretation that those celestials are always devoid of the six consciousnesses, because the holy teachings say that they are devoid of evolving consciousnesses, because it is said that they only possess the material factor (*rūpa-aṅga*), and because it is said that that [realm] is a mindless stage (*acittaka-bhūmi*).

There is an interpretation that when these celestials are in a state when they are about to die [in the mindless realm], they must generate evolving consciousnesses so that immediately upon death they necessarily generate a thirst that nourishes a birth below, because the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* says, “When a subsequent conceptualization has been born, these sentient beings fall from that [existence or *samādhi*].” However, as for saying that they are devoid of evolving consciousnesses, etc., this means for a long time, not that they are totally absent.

There is an interpretation that when they are born [in that realm], they also have evolving consciousnesses, because in that [unconscious celestial realm] they must generate passions that nourish birth, because, as in other [realms], they must have evolving consciousnesses at the beginning of their basic existences. The

Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra says, “If he is born in that [realm], he just enters it but does not generate [conceptualization], because if conceptualization occurs, he falls from that [realm].” If he does not have evolving consciousnesses during the time of his basic existence, how can it be called “entering” [that state devoid of conceptualization], because it can be called “entering” if first he has [the consciousnesses] and later does not have them. According to the *Viniścayasamgrahaṇī*, the cessation of all mind and mental activities existing from birth is called “unconsciousness” (*asaṃjñika*). The meaning of these words indicates that at the beginning of that basic existence, evolving consciousnesses born of retribution initially exist a short time, and that they are not born later due to the power of former causes and conditions. Consequently, [this absence] attracts and generates a state known as “retribution and indeterminate,” which is called “without conceptualization,” just as the two *samādhis* are called “good” by virtue of the good they attract and generate. On the contrary, if none of the evolving consciousnesses is active, how can they be said to be only cessation [of mind and mental activities] acquired at birth? Therefore in the first state of that [existence], the evolving consciousnesses occur for awhile.

These celestials only abide in the fourth trance state (*dhyāna*), because conceptualization below [that stage] is gross and unstable and difficult to eliminate, and there is no occasion for the retribution of nonconceptualization above [it]; that is, because the volition that can attract and instigate this unconscious *samādhi* is able to provoke the results of retribution of these celestials.

61. The Two Mindless *Samādhis*

AND IN THE TWO MINDLESS *SAMĀDHIS* means that both of the *samādhis* of unconsciousness and cessation are called “mindless” (*acittaka*) because they all are devoid of the six consciousnesses.

“Unconscious *samādhi*” means that there are ordinary beings (*prthagjana*) who have subdued craving of the Śubhakṛtsna [realm] but who have not subdued impurity of the superior [trance states].

Due to the concept of escape [from *saṃsāra*] being the foremost of their volitions, [this *samādhi*] causes the cessation of non-perpetually active mind and mental activities. It is called “unconscious” because cessation of conceptualization is foremost, and it is called *samādhi* because it causes the body to be tranquil and harmonious.

There are three degrees of cultivation of this *samādhi*. He who cultivates the lowest degree necessarily regresses [in maintaining *samādhi*] in this present life (*drṣṭa-dharma*) and cannot quickly recover [the *samādhi*]. Later, when he is born among those celestials, [*samādhi*] is not extremely bright and pure, nor is the form large, and he definitely dies in the interval. 37c

He who cultivates the middle degree does not necessarily regress, and if he regresses he quickly recovers it. Later, when he is born among those celestials, even though the [*samādhi*] is extremely bright and pure and its form is large, still it is not maximal, and although one [sometimes] dies in the interval it is not certain.

He who cultivates the superior degree necessarily does not regress. Later, when he is born among those celestials, there is maximal brightness and purity and the form is large, and he necessarily does not die in the interval but only falls [from that existence] once the life span is completely filled. This *samādhi* is only connected with the fourth trance state. Also, it is exclusively good, because it is attracted by that [trance state]. It is absent in stages below and above, as a result of what was said earlier. Actions (*karma*) of the four [trance states] belongs to the three [categories of retribution] with the exception of that which conforms to the present life.

There is an interpretation that this *samādhi* only occurs in the realm of desire, because it occurs through the power of non-Buddhist teachings and because among humans, discernment and understanding are extremely acute. According to another interpretation, after having first cultivated it in the realm of desire, one can, upon subsequently being born in the realm of form, bring it before one, excluding the unconscious celestials, because it is ultimate. Consequently, it is only impure and not generated by

the saints, because it is entered by way of disgust for conceptualization and a delight in its fruits.

The *samādhi* of cessation means that there are saints who are post-learners or learners who have subdued and gotten rid of the craving of [the stage of] “nothing at all” (*ākīṃcanya-āyatana*) but [in whom] craving of the upper stage [i.e., *naivasamjñānāsamjñā-āyatana*] is or is not present. As a result of emphasizing the stopping of conceptualization and bringing about the cessation of [both] non-perpetually active and perpetually active defiled mind and mental activities, it is called “cessation.” It is called *samādhi* because it causes the body to be tranquil and harmonious. Due to a one-sided disgust for feeling and conceptualization, it is called the “*samādhi* of the cessation of those [feelings and conceptualization]” (*samjñā-veditā-nirodha-samāpatti*).

There are three classes of cultivation of this *samādhi*. He who cultivates the lowest degree necessarily regresses during his present life and cannot recover [the *samādhi*] immediately. He who cultivates the middle degree does not necessarily regress in the present life, and if he regresses he immediately recovers it. He who cultivates the superior degree absolutely does not regress.

In the preliminary practice of this *samādhi*, he who enters it must, as a preparation, be supported by a discursive contemplation of the [realm of the] peak of existence, which is pure, because among the sequential *samādhis* it is the supreme one. Even though it belongs to the peak of existence, it is categorized as pure. If, having cultivated this *samādhi*, one acquires mastery, one’s mind is able to make it present in other stages. Although it belongs to the truth of the path, it is categorized as “neither learner nor post-learner,” because it resembles *nirvāṇa*.

The first appearance of this *samādhi* exists only among humans, because it occurs as a result of the power of the teachings of the Buddha and his disciples, and because among humans, discernment and understanding are extremely acute. Also, one makes it appear before one later in the upper two realms, because the *Udāyi Sūtra* proves that the formless [celestials] are also called “celestials consisting of thought” (*manomaya-deva*). Those who as

yet do not believe and receive the teaching of store consciousness do not produce this *samādhi*, because they fear that the absence of form and mind results in annihilation. Believers born there are able to have it present before them, because they know that there is a store consciousness and that they are not annihilated.

In order for this *samādhi* to appear, it is necessary to eliminate the propensities of the three realms that are eliminated by the [path of] insight, because ordinary beings are unable to subdue and destroy mind and mental activities of the peak of existence, because this *samādhi* is subtle, and in order for it to be attracted, the subsequently acquired knowledge of the two kinds of emptiness must be realized. 38a

There is an interpretation that of the propensities of the lower eight stages to be eliminated by [the path of] cultivation, it is necessary to eliminate wholly [those of the realm of] desire. The remainder are subdued or eliminated, and later one can for the first time generate this *samādhi*, because the propensities of the realm of desire, which are of two natures, are complex and strong in obstructing *samādhi*, and because it is only said that nonreturners (*anāgāmin*), post-learners of the three vehicles, and various bodhisattvas obtain this *samādhi*. In accordance with circumstances, they are born in the upper eight stages and all are able subsequently to generate it.

There is an interpretation that it is necessary to eliminate the propensities of the lower four stages that are to be eliminated by [the path of] cultivation. The remainder are to be subdued or eliminated and, later, one can for the first time generate this *samādhi*, because the seeds of passions associated with feelings of change are strong in obstructing *samādhi*. In accordance with circumstances, they are born in the upper five stages and all are able subsequently to generate this *samādhi*.

[The Sarvāstivādins object,] you say that if one subdues the propensities of the lower [stages], one can generate this *samādhi* and later, not eliminating [the seeds] or regressing, be born in the upper stages, but will that one, having been born in the upper

[stages], still eliminate the propensities of the lower [stages]? [We reply,] their elimination is no problem, because one resembles someone born in the upper stages who eliminates the innate propensities of *manas* of the lower [stages].

Now the power of the antidote [to the passions] of nonreturners is strong. During the state of nourishing birth, they do not generate passions. It is only as a result of the seeds of the propensities that they nourish birth in the upper realms. Even though there may or may not be regression in the propensities one has subdued, this still does not mean that one is born in an upper stage by subduing the [propensities of the] lower. Therefore there is no error [in maintaining] that one born in the upper [stages] eliminates the [propensities of the] lower.

In the case of various bodhisattvas of the rank of the two [non-Mahayana] vehicles who have already obtained the *samādhi* of cessation and have converted [to the Mahayana], they are able to generate this *samādhi* in all stages. If they are not of this type, some with complete minds of the seventh stage are able eternally to subdue all passions. Even though they have not eternally eliminated the propensities [to be eliminated by] cultivation of the realm of desire, they are able to generate this *samādhi* as if they had already eliminated them, because the [Yogācārabhūmi] *Śāstra* says that the bodhisattva, having entered the “far going” (*dūramgamā*) stage, is then able to manifest this *samādhi* of cessation. Some, from the first stage, are able eternally to subdue all passions, as if they were arhats. They all generate this *samādhi* during all ten [bodhisattva] stages, because a scripture says, “The bodhisattva is able, in the first six stages, to manifest the *samādhi* of cessation.”

62. Sloth and Stupefaction

Mindless SLOTH (*middha*) and STUPEFACTION (*mūrchana*) refer to an extremely heavy sloth and stupefaction that prevent all the first six consciousnesses from being actually active. Sloth is a physical state attracted by such conditions as extreme fatigue and is contrary to the [operation of the] first six consciousnesses. For that

reason, it is called “extremely heavy sloth.” Even though it is not in substance [sloth], it is conventionally given that name because it resembles [sloth]. Stupefaction is a physical state attracted by such conditions as a troubled disposition and is contrary to [the operation of the] six consciousnesses. For that reason, it is called “extremely heavy stupefaction.” Alternately, both of these are minor parts of the sense base of tangibility (*spraṣṭavya-āyatana*). Excluding these [above] five states, mental consciousness always occurs.

63. Birth and Death

The times of birth and death are also devoid of mental consciousness. Why is it said that it is inactive only in five states? There is an interpretation that birth and death are indicated by the word AND [in Vasubandhu’s verse]. That explanation is not reasonable. Why? Because it is only said that six times are said to be mindless; i.e., the above five states and [*nirvāṇa*] without remainder. 38b It should be said that birth and death are included in stupefaction, because these are extreme stages of stupefaction. The word AND indicates that the five are not confused. This shows that after the six consciousnesses have been [temporarily] eliminated, a return from their own seeds is supported by the fundamental consciousness, and for that reason [Vasubandhu] does not mention entering [*nirvāṇa*] without remainder [because the six consciousnesses do not return then]. Of the five states, ordinary beings possess four, excluding the *samādhi* of cessation; the saints possess only the last three; among these [three], Tathāgatas and independent bodhisattvas retain one, because they are devoid of sloth and stupefaction.

64. Simultaneity of the Six Consciousnesses

Therefore, of the eight consciousnesses, two—mind [i.e., the eighth consciousness] and *manas*—always evolve simultaneously in all the sentient. If the sixth occurs, then three evolve simultaneously. When one to five of the others occur through the coming together of conditions, then from four to eight are simultaneous. This is the

abbreviated explanation of the simultaneous evolving of consciousnesses.

If in one sentient being many consciousnesses evolve simultaneously, how can it be said that it is a single sentient being? [We reply,] if sentience is established on the basis of the number of consciousnesses, then when one is in a mindless state, one must not be sentient. Also, in a state when another mind [i.e., of another realm] is present, how could it be said that oneself is sentient? However, it does not contradict reason to establish sentience on the basis of the number of [seeds that constitute] the vital principle or on consciousness as retribution, because both are perpetual and unitary.

[It is asked,] in a single individual, there is a single similar and immediately antecedent condition, so how can there be evolution of many consciousnesses at the same time? [We reply,] since you concede that this one [condition] attracts many mental activities, why not concede that it can attract many kinds of minds? Also, who says definitely that this condition is single? He who says that many consciousnesses are simultaneous concedes that this condition is manifold.

Also, when desire grasps many objects at the same time, is not the presence of the many objects grasped at once? Because it is not reasonable that when blending through the power of the combination of organs, objects, etc., that consciousnesses are born successively. Also, although there is no distinction in nature of mental activities, still they vary as species, and you concede that they are born simultaneously, so why not concede that mind of varying species occurs simultaneously?

Also, just as waves and images [in mirrors] appear as many supported by one [ocean or mirror], many consciousnesses occur simultaneously supported by a single mind. Also, if you do not concede that mental [consciousness] occurs simultaneously with the five [sense] consciousnesses, then when they grasp their objects, they would not perceive them clearly, because, like mental consciousness when it is distracted, the objects have ceased long before.

[It is asked,] how can the one mental consciousness associated with the [first] five consciousnesses grasp one or many objects such as color? [We reply,] in the same way that consciousness, such as the visual, each grasps one or many of its own objects. Here, too, what is the error? Because both the seen [part] and the seeing [part of consciousness] have numerous characteristics.

Why [it is asked] are not various consciousnesses of the same species simultaneous? [We reply,] because if [a consciousness's] own object is perceivable, when one [consciousness] has been able to perceive it, the other [similar acts of the same consciousness] are of no use. [It is asked,] in that case, since the five consciousnesses have each perceived their own objects, what is the need for a simultaneously present mental consciousness to perceive it? [We reply,] mental consciousness occurring with the five [consciousnesses] aids the five and causes their birth. It is not solely in order to perceive the objects of the five consciousnesses. Also, it is different from visual consciousness, etc., because it can clearly perceive and grasp those objects, and therefore it is not useless. Consequently, the [*Samdhi-nirmocana*] *Sūtra* says that mental consciousness is called “possess- 38c
ing discrimination,” which is not the case with the five consciousnesses.

Since many consciousnesses evolve simultaneously, why are they not associates? Because of nonidentical objects, and, granting that the objects are the same, the substance and number of supports of that one or this one differ, just as the consciousnesses of the five organs are mutually unassociated.

Chapter VI

Oneness or Difference of the Eight Consciousnesses

The eight consciousnesses in their self-natures cannot be said to be definitely one, because of the differences of modes of activity, supports, objects, and associates, and also because not all cease when one does, and because such characteristics as perfuming and being perfumed are each different.

Also, they are not definitely different, because the [*Laṅkāvatāra*] *Sūtra* says that the eight consciousnesses are not differentiated, like water and waves, because if they are definitely different, they must not be of the nature of cause and effect [for each other], and because, like illusory things, etc., they are devoid of definite natures [such as identical or different]. As was mentioned earlier, the distinct characteristics of the consciousnesses are based on the convention of reason (*yukti-saṃvṛti*), not on ultimate truth (*paramārtha-satya*). In ultimate truth, mind [i.e., reasoning] and words are cut off. As a verse [of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*] says,

Mind, thought, and the eight kinds of consciousness
Have distinct characteristics from a worldly point of view.
Distinct characteristics do not exist from the point of view
of ultimate truth,
Because there is neither characteristic nor the
characterized.

Chapter VII

Consciousness Only

We have extensively distinguished the characteristics of the three [consciousnesses] capable of transforming as the supports of the two parts that are transformed from them. How must we understand that the metaphorical “self” and “dharma” that are transformations based on consciousness are not separate realities, and consequently that all are consciousness only? The Verses [of Vasubandhu] say,

THE VARIOUS CONSCIOUSNESSES TRANSFORM
AS IMAGINATION AND THE IMAGINED.
AS A RESULT OF THIS, ALL THESE ARE NONEXISTENT.
THEREFORE ALL ARE CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY.

The Treatise says that THE VARIOUS CONSCIOUSNESSES means the previously discussed three transforming consciousnesses and their mental activities. The term TRANSFORM is established because all are able to transform to resemble the two parts that are seeing (*darśana*) and seen (*nimitta*). That which transforms into the seeing part is called IMAGINATION, because it is able to grasp images. That which transforms into the seen part is called THE IMAGINED, because it is grasped by the seeing [part]. As a result of this correct principle, all real selves and dharmas definitely do not exist apart from what has been transformed from consciousness, because there is not a separate thing apart from the grasping and the grasped, because there are no real things apart from these two characteristics. Therefore no conditioned or unconditioned [dharmas], whether real or metaphorical, [exist] apart from consciousness.

The word ONLY denies real things apart from consciousness, but it does not [deny] such dharmas as mental activities, etc., that are not apart from consciousness.

Alternately, TRANSFORMS means that internal consciousnesses transform to resemble selves and dharmas as characteristics of external objects. This transformation is called IMAGINATION, because its self-nature is false imagination; that is, mind and mental activities of the three realms. Objects that are grasped by it are THE IMAGINED, which are the falsely imagined natures of real selves and dharmas. Because imagination transforms to resemble external objects, characteristics of false selves and dharmas as the imagined natures of real selves and dharmas are definitely all non-existent, because they have been denied [as realities] by former quotations from teachings and by reason. Therefore ALL ARE CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY, because the existence of false imagination (*abhūta-parikalpa*) is commonly accepted [by all schools]. The word ONLY does not deny dharmas that are not apart from consciousness; therefore, real emptiness, etc., are by nature existent. Consequently, the two extremes of eternalism and annihilationism are avoided, and the meaning of consciousness only is demonstrated as conforming to the Middle Way.

1. Proofs of Consciousness Only

[It is asked,] as a result of what teachings and reasoning is the principle of consciousness only demonstrated? [We reply,] have we not already discussed it? [It is answered,] only incompletely. You do not demonstrate your own principle by refuting another's principle. You must again explain carefully and demonstrate the teachings and reasoning.

According to what the [*Daśabhūmika*] *Sūtra* says, "The three realms are mind only." Also, [the *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra*] says, "Objects are only manifestations of consciousness." Also, [the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*] says, "None of the dharmas is apart from mind." Also, [the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa Sūtra*] says, "Sentient beings become impure or pure through mind." It also is said, "Bodhisattvas

who are provided with the four knowledges can, in accordance with awakening, enter [the truth of] consciousness only and objectlessness.”

[The four knowledges are,] first, knowledge of images of different consciousnesses (*viruddha-vijñāna-nimitta-jñāna*). That is, the same thing perceived by ghosts, humans, celestials, etc., is different for each in accordance with differences of karma. If objects really exist, how can this be possible? The second is knowledge of consciousness without [real] objects (*anālamhana-vijñāna-jñāna*). That is, one takes as objects such things as past, future, dream objects, images, etc., that do not really exist but that are possible as manifestations of consciousness. Since these objects are nonexistent, so must others be. Third, knowledge that [all beings] must be naturally without error (*anabhisaṃskāra-viparīta-jñāna*). That is, if the knowledge of the ignorant attained real objects, they must naturally achieve errorlessness and obtain liberation without effort.

Fourth, the knowledge of change [of objects] in accordance with the triple knowledge (*trividha-jñāna-anuvartaka-jñāna*). The first [of the three knowledges] is the knowledge of change [of objects] following the knowledge of one who has mastery [of mind] (*vaśita-jñāna-anuvartaka-jñāna*). That is, he who has realized mastery of mind can transform earth [into gold], etc., at will. If objects really exist, how can they be transformed? The second [of the three] is the knowledge of change [of objects] following the knowledge of one with clear perception (*pravīcaya-jñāna-anuvartaka-jñāna*). That is, he who achieves the superior *samādhis* and cultivates contemplation of dharmas contemplates one object, and a multitude of characteristics [such as origination and cessation] appear before him. If [these] objects are real, how can they be mentally transformed? The third [knowledge] is the knowledge of change [of objects] following nondiscriminative knowledge (*nirvikalpika-jñāna-anuvartaka-jñāna*). That is, when one generates and realizes true, nondiscriminative knowledge, none of the characteristics of objects appears. If objects really exist, how is it possible for them not to appear?

The bodhisattva who achieves these four knowledges definitely is enlightened in and penetrates the principle of consciousness only. Also, a verse [of the *Ghanavyūha*] *Sūtra* says,

None of the objects of mind, thought, and consciousness
Is separate from its own [mental] nature.
Therefore, I declare that all things
Are consciousness only; there is nothing else.

Proofs in these holy teachings are numerous.

2. Reasoning

The commonly agreed upon visual consciousness, etc., do not take as objects form, etc., that is separate from themselves, because [each] is one of the five, like the others. The other [mental] consciousness, because it is a consciousness like visual consciousness, etc., also does not take as direct objects dharmas that are separate from itself. These direct objects are definitely not separate from these [six] consciousnesses, because they are one of the two [parts of consciousness], like [the seeing part] that can take objects. They are definitely not separate from mind and mental activities, because they are objective dharmas, like associated dharmas. These correct reasons and proofs are numerous, and therefore we must
39b deeply believe and accept [the truth of] consciousness only. Self and dharmas do not exist; emptiness and consciousness are not nonexistent. These are [respectively] separate from existence and separate from nonexistence, and therefore [our teaching] conforms to the Middle Way.

As a result of this, Maitreya has two verses [in the *Madhyānta-vibhāga*]:

False imagination exists;
The duality in it does not exist.
In it, there is only emptiness;
In that, there is also this [imagination].

Therefore, I declare that all dharmas
 Are neither empty nor not empty,
 Because of existence, nonexistence, and existence;
 This conforms to the Middle Way.

These verses speak on the basis of only defiled dependence on others (*paratantra*), but in reality there is also a pure part of the dependent on others.

3. Nine Objections

[Objection:] If there is only internal consciousness that occurs resembling external objects, how is that we see that the places, times, bodies, and functions of worldly sentient and insentient beings are [sometimes] determinate and [sometimes] indeterminate? [We reply,] we must dispel this doubt by comparison with dream objects [which have the same characteristics but are not real external things], etc.

[Objection:] For what reason did the World-Honored One speak of twelve sense bases? [We reply,] these are transformations based on consciousness, not separate, real entities. In order to introduce the emptiness of the person (*pudgala-sūnyatā*), he spoke of the six double dharmas [i.e., eye and visual objects, ears and sounds, etc.], just as he spoke of continuous sentience in order to deny the [false] view of annihilation. In order to introduce the emptiness of dharmas, he spoke later of consciousness only, because it makes us realize that external dharmas are also nonexistent.

[Objection:] Is not the nature of this consciousness only also empty? [We reply,] no. [They ask,] why? [We reply,] because it is not to be grasped. We speak of the emptiness of dharmas on the basis that the falsely grasped real dharmas that are transformations of consciousness are in reality ungraspable (*anupalabha*). We are not speaking of the emptiness of dharmas that is the nature of the ineffable consciousness only that is realized by correct knowledge. If this consciousness [only] does not exist, then there

is no relative truth and, because there is no relative truth, there also is no ultimate truth, because ultimate truth and relative truth are established through mutual dependence. He who rejects the two truths wrongly grasps emptiness, and the Buddhas have said that such a one is incurable. It should be understood that various dharmas are empty and not empty, and that is why Maitreya uttered the previous two verses.

[Objection:] If the material sense bases (*rūpa-āyatana*) are in substance consciousness, why does [consciousness] evolve resembling characteristics of form, manifesting a homogeneous, firm, stable series? [We reply,] because they originate from the power of perfuming energy of names and words, and because [form] is the supporting sense base for defiled and pure dharmas. If it did not exist, there would be no error, and then there would be no defilement and also no pure dharmas. Therefore the various consciousnesses appear resembling form. As a verse says,

Images of confusion and confusion itself
Must be conceded to be material consciousness
And immaterial consciousness [respectively].
If [the first] is lacking, the other is also lacking.

[Objection:] External objects of form, etc., are clearly present and authenticated [by visual consciousness, etc.]. How can that which is acquired through direct perception be rejected as nonexistent? [We reply,] when they are authenticated by direct perception, they are not grasped as being external. Afterwards, the discrimination of thought falsely generates a thought of “outside.” Therefore directly perceived objects are the transformation of the seen part of the consciousnesses themselves, and for that reason it is said that they exist. When form, etc., grasped by mental consciousness as external and real are falsely judged to exist, it is said that they are nonexistent. Also, objects of form, etc., are not form but resemble form, and they are not external but seem to be external. They are like objects in dreams and cannot be grasped as being real, external objects.

[Objection:] If during the waking state forms are all like objects in dreams and not separate from consciousness, then, just as after a dream we awaken and know that it was only mental, why, when we are awake, do we not know that our own material objects are consciousness only? [We reply,] it is like being in a dream prior to awakening and being incapable of self-understanding. In order to be retrospectively awakened [to the dream state], we must reach awakening. You must understand that the objective forms of the awakened state are the same. We are incapable of self-understanding prior to a state of awakening and are capable of being retrospectively awakened [from delusion] when we arrive at true awakening. If we have not acquired true awakening, we are always situated in a dream. That is why the Buddha said that it is the long night of *saṃsāra*. Consequently, we do not clearly grasp that material objects are consciousness only.

[Objection:] External form is really nonexistent and presumably not the object of internal consciousness. The minds of others really exist, so why are they not also one's own objects [of consciousness]? [We reply,] who says that the minds of others are not the objects of one's own consciousness? We just do not say that they are its immediate objects. That is, when a consciousness is born, it is devoid of real function, unlike hands, etc., that immediately grasp external things, or the sun, etc., that spreads its light and immediately illuminates external objects. [Consciousness] is only said to perceive the minds of others because it is like a mirror in which appear seemingly external objects. It cannot immediately perceive [others' minds]. What it immediately perceives are its own transformations. Therefore, a scripture says, "There is not the slightest dharma that is capable of seizing other dharmas. It is just that when consciousness is born, it appears resembling images and is said to seize things." As with having the minds of others as objects, so with form, etc.

[Objection:] Since there are different objects [of others' minds], how can you say that there is consciousness only? [We reply,] how obstinate! You doubt everything you touch. Does the teaching of

consciousness only just speak of a single consciousness? [They ask, | if that is not so, then what | do you mean]?

[We reply,] listen carefully. If there were only a single consciousness, how could there be differences of the ten directions, ordinary and wise, venerable and base, and cause and results, etc.? Who would preach for whom? How could one seek the Dharma? Therefore the words “consciousness only” have a profound significance. The word “consciousness” indicates in a general way that all sentient beings are said to have eight consciousnesses, six classes of mental activities, the seen and seeing [parts| that are transformations [of consciousness], differences of states, and the ultimate reality expressed by the principle of emptiness, because [these categories are, respectively, | the distinct characteristics of consciousness, associates of consciousness, the two transformations [of consciousness], their three states, and the true nature of the four [above categories]. In this way, the various dharmas are not separate from consciousness and are generally named “consciousness.” The word “only” just denies really existing form, etc., that the ignorant grasp as definitely separate from the various consciousnesses.

If in this way one knows the meaning of “consciousness only,” one will be able to be without error, be well provided with equipment, quickly penetrate the emptiness of dharmas, realize supreme awakening, and aid those in the transmigration of *saṃsāra*. This cannot be achieved by one who totally rejects all things as nonexistent. Therefore one must without doubt believe that all is consciousness only.

Chapter VIII

Causality

If there is only consciousness entirely and no external condition, from what are the many imaginations [such as the eight consciousnesses, etc.] born? The Verses [of Vasubandhu] say,

FROM THE CONSCIOUSNESS THAT IS ALL SEEDS
TRANSFORMATION [OCCURS] IN SUCH-AND-SUCH WAYS;
DUE TO THE POWER OF MUTUAL INFLUENCE.
THIS AND THAT IMAGINATION IS BORN.

40a

The Treatise says that CONSCIOUSNESS THAT IS ALL SEEDS (*sarva-bīja-vijñāna*) means the particular energies (*śakti*) in the root consciousness that are capable of producing their own results. These are called ALL SEEDS because they produce results [named] “similar” (*niṣyanda*), “retribution” (*vipāka*), “[resulting from] human effort” (*puruṣa-kāra*), and “dominant” (*adhipati*). The reason for the exclusion of [the result named] “disentanglement” (*visaṃyoga*) is that it is not born from seeds. It is only realizable and not the result of seeds, because one must manifest and generate the path and eliminate the bonds in order to obtain it. Although this has the meaning of mutual influence, it is not what is being discussed here, because here it says that [seeds] are the kind that are able to produce imagination [directly].

This consciousness [that holds all the seeds] is their substance; therefore, they are called “consciousness” because the seeds have no separate nature apart from the root consciousness. The two words SEED CONSCIOUSNESS [in the verse] omit what is not [at once] seeds and consciousness, because there are consciousnesses that

are not seeds and seeds that are not consciousness [such as grain seeds]. Also, SEED CONSCIOUSNESS indicates the seeds in the consciousness, not the consciousness that bears seeds, as will be explained later.

Because of the aid of other conditions, the seeds in this consciousness [undergo] TRANSFORMATION IN SUCH-AND-SUCH WAYS. That is, they evolve from the state of birth up to the time of maturity. The word SUCH [in “such-and-such”] is repeated to indicate the plurality of kinds of transformation; that is, because “all seeds” indicates consciousness seeds exhaustively, [meaning] the three perfumings of common seeds, the uncommon, etc.

POWER OF MUTUAL INFLUENCE (*anyonyaśa*) means the eight actual consciousnesses, their associates, the seen and seeing parts, etc., because all have the power to assist each other. Actual consciousnesses, etc., are named IMAGINATIONS, because false imagination is their self-nature. There are many kinds of imagination, hence the words THIS AND THAT.

The meaning of this verse is that although there are no external conditions [for the emergence of imagination], due to the differences in transformation of all the seeds existing in the root consciousness, and because of the power of mutual influence of the actual eight consciousnesses, etc., THIS AND THAT IMAGINATION are also born. Why assume external conditions for generating imaginations? You must understand that the origin of pure dharmas is the same, because they are born from the conditions of actual pure seeds and the actual [consciousnesses].

1. The Four Conditions

As it was said, the conditions consisting of seeds and actual [dharmas] produce imagination. How must we understand the characteristics of this conditioned birth? There are four conditions (*pratyaya*).

2. Condition as Cause

The first is the condition as cause. This means that a conditioned dharma directly provides its own result. Its substance is twofold:

one, seeds; two, actual [dharmas]. “Seeds” means the various energies in the root consciousness that are good, defiled, and non-determined of all realms, stages, etc. They have the ability to attract subsequent energies [i.e., seeds] of their own species, and they generate simultaneous actual results [i.e., consciousnesses] of their own species. These are of the nature of conditions as cause only in that [situation].

As for actual [dharmas], these are the [first] seven evolving consciousnesses, with their associates [i.e., mental activities], the seen and seeing [parts] that are their transformations, natures [of good, etc.], the realms, stages, etc., with the exception of the good [dharmas] of the fruit of Buddhahood and extremely weak and nondetermined [dharmas]. The others perfume the root consciousness and generate seeds of their own species. These are of the nature of conditions as cause only from the point of view of the other. Because the group of the eighth consciousness has nothing to perfume, and because [mental activities] cannot perfume alone in the absence of their supports [i.e., consciousness], and because [the eighth and first six consciousnesses] are extremely slight, and [in Buddhas, the eighth consciousness] is extremely perfect, these do not perfume or create seeds.

The development of the same species of actual [dharmas] is not of the nature of condition as cause among themselves, because they are born of their own seeds. The development of all of different species is also not a condition as cause among themselves, because they do not directly produce [each other]. As for the explanation that development of actual [dharmas] of both different and same species is a condition as cause among themselves, you should understand it as hypothetical, or it is a concession [to the Sarvāstivādins]. There is the simple explanation [in the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*] that seeds are of the nature of conditions as cause. That is in accordance with their prominence and value [as a continuous series], but that is not an utterly reasonable explanation, because the holy teachings say that the development of the [first seven] evolving consciousnesses and the *ālaya* are conditions as causes for each other.

40b

3. Similar and Immediately Antecedent Condition

The second is the similar and immediately antecedent condition. This means the eight actual consciousnesses and their mental activities as a prior group vacate and then summon a subsequent [group] that is of its own species, without interruption, and similar, and cause it to be definitely born. The many seeds of the same species are not categorized as this condition, because they evolve simultaneously, like the unassociated [dharmas]. Consequently, the eight consciousnesses are not conditions [of this kind] for each other. Even though mental activities always evolve together with mind, they are its associates, and they therefore combine with them to resemble a unity that cannot be supposed to be separate or differentiated, and for that reason they act upon each other as similar and immediately antecedent conditions.

Upon entering [nirvāṇa] without remainder, the mind is extremely weak and lacking in the function of vacating and summoning. Also, it will not [subsequently] generate similar and antecedent dharmas. Therefore it is not this condition. How do we know that this is so? There is evidence in the [Yogācārabhūmi] Śāstra that says, “If immediately after this consciousness, etc., another [subsequent] consciousness, etc., is definitely born, then we say that the former is the similar and immediately antecedent condition of the latter.”

It must be said as a consequence of this interpretation that it is possible for the *āḍāna* [i.e., store] consciousness in [one of] the three realms and nine of the stages to act as a similar and immediately antecedent condition for that of another [realm or stage], because [*āḍāna* consciousness] in a superior [realm or stage] introduces birth and death in an inferior [realm or stage], etc., [and vice versa]. An impure [consciousness] immediately has birth as pure [consciousness], but the pure is definitely not born as an impure one, because once mirror knowledge occurs, it must never come to an end. The same is so of the relationship between a good [*āḍāna* consciousness] and a nondetermined one.

From what realm does this [impure consciousness] generate purity? Either from the realm of form or from the realm of desire. That is, in the case of ordinary beings who seek Buddhahood, [that consciousness] definitely generates pure [consciousness] from the realm of form, because it is necessary for them to be subsequently born above the Śuddhavāsika [realm of celestials] in the abode of Maheśvara [at the apex of the realm of form] in order to obtain *bodhi*. In the case of [followers of] the two vehicles who turn toward great *bodhi*, [that consciousness] definitely generates purity from the realm of desire, because only in the realm of desire does one turn [toward *bodhi*] and preserve the body. The reason is that even though they must go to the abode of Maheśvara in order to become Buddhas, still the natural bodies they preserve by the power of great vows are those of the realm of desire.

There is an interpretation that in the realm of form, also, there are disciples (*śrāvaka*) who turn to the Mahayana and vow to preserve their bodies, and this does not disagree with teachings or reason. Therefore the purity of the eighth consciousness of disciples is capable of appearing from the mind of the realm of form. As for the absence of turning [to the Mahayana] in the five Śuddhavāsika [realms], it is because the scriptures do not say that [beings there] manifest the great mind [of *bodhi*].

The seventh evolving consciousness of [one of] the three realms and nine stages may act as a similar and immediately antecedent condition [for another seventh consciousness of a different realm or stage], because it is bound to the place of birth of the eighth consciousness. Impure and pure [seventh consciousnesses] may produce each other, because in the state of the ten stages, they are able to attract each other. This is also so of the relationship between good and nondetermined [states of *manas*].

40c

Defiled and nondefiled [states] among the nondeterminates vacate and summon each other, because knowledge of the emptiness of the person and its fruit [and defiled states] are able to attract each other as prior or subsequent states. Impure and pure produce each other in the realms of desire and form but not in the formless realm, because in the upper stages, bodhisattvas are not born in that [realm].

The sixth evolving consciousness of [one of] the three realms and nine stages, which may be impure, pure, good, not good, etc., may each act as a similar and immediately antecedent condition for the other, because they attract each other in the state of nourishing rebirth, etc. The preliminary occurrence of purity [of the sixth consciousness] only follows [consciousness of] the realm of form, because the good that is connected with the aids to penetration (*nirvedha-bhāgiya*) is only [connected with] the realm of form.

Consciousnesses of eye, ear, and body in two realms and two stages, and the two consciousnesses of nose and tongue of one realm and one stage, act as similar and immediately antecedent conditions for their own species. Good, etc., [states of consciousness] do likewise, you should know, in their relations between each other.

There is an interpretation that whether impure or pure, the [first] five consciousnesses act as similar and immediately antecedent conditions for their own species, because they may generate each other prior to the achievement of Buddhahood. According to another interpretation, the pure arises subsequent to the impure, but not vice-versa, because the pure five consciousnesses do not exist in non-Buddhas, because their five material organs are definitely impure, and because [the organs] are categorized as being the seen part of consciousness as retribution.

[Why do the five impure organs not generate pure consciousness?] Because the impure [organs] are uncommon [or special] supports, are necessarily simultaneous [with the five consciousnesses], and have the same objects [as the corresponding consciousnesses], because the manifestation of pure consciousness by the organs does not correspond with reason, and because of the difference of clarity and dullness of these two [respectively] regarding objects.

4. Condition as Perceptual Object

The third is the condition in the form of [perceptual] object. This means an existing dharma perceived by mind and mental activities and the support of mind and mental activities that are closely tied to their own forms. Its substance is twofold: the immediate

and the distant. If it is not separated from the essence [i.e., consciousness] that has it for an object and is that which the seeing part, etc., perceives and has as an internal support, you must understand that that is an immediate condition as object. Even though it is separated from the essence that has it for an object, if it acts as an essence capable of generating that is perceived by [consciousness] and which supports [consciousness] internally, you must understand that that is the distant condition as object.

All [consciousnesses] that have objects have immediate conditions as objects, because they must not be born apart from an internal object of perception and support. Those that take objects sometimes have distant conditions as objects [but not always], because they can be born apart from external objects of perception and supports [such as the future, past, etc.].

As for the group of the eighth consciousness, there is an interpretation that it has only an immediate condition as object, because it transforms [as objects] spontaneously through the power of karmic causes [within it]. According to another interpretation, it definitely also has distant conditions as objects, because, when it transforms into [the body of] another, it must be supported by the essence of the other in order to transform.

There is an interpretation that neither of the [above] two explanations corresponds with reason. Bodies and lands of oneself and others may experience each other, because the transformations [of consciousness] of others are one's own essence. One's own seeds are not experienced by another, because it does not correspond to reason that they transform into another's, because the seeds of various sentient beings are not equal. It must be said that there may or may not be distant conditions as objects for this group [of the eighth consciousness].

As for the group of the seventh consciousness, prior to transmutation of the support, [*manas*] must be supported by an external essence [i.e., the eighth consciousness], because [impurity] is innate. Therefore it definitely has a remote condition as object. Once the support is transmuted, it does not necessarily have it,

41a because it has no external essence [as object] when it has as objects true reality (*tathatā*), etc.

The mode of activity of the group of the sixth consciousness is strong and active and is able to evolve freely in all states, so it may or may not have as a support an external essence. [Consequently,] the existence or nonexistence of distant objects as condition is uncertain.

As for the group of the first five consciousnesses, in the state prior to the transmutation of the support, they are coarse, dull, and weak and therefore must be supported by external essences. Therefore it is also certain that they have distant conditions as objects. Once they have undergone the transmutation of the support, they do not necessarily have them, because they do not have external essences [as objects] when they have as objects such things as past, future, etc.

5. Dominant Condition

The fourth is the dominant condition. This means an existing dharma with a superior power and function that can, vis-à-vis other dharmas, either promote them or oppose them. Even though the previous [three] conditions are also dominant, the present fourth one excludes those and accepts others in order to show the distinct characteristics of various conditions.

The function of promoting and opposing evolves in four situations: generating, sustaining, realizing, and obtaining. Even though the functions of the dominant [condition] are many depending on events, there are only twenty-two that are predominant and obvious. You must understand that these are the twenty-two capacities (*indriya*). [These are as follows:]

The first five material capacities (*rūpa-indriya*), because their nature is that of the pure form of the eye, etc., that are transformations of root consciousness, etc.

Male and female capacities (*vyañjana-indriya*), because they are categorized as the bodily capacity; they are therefore a small part of that capacity.

The vital capacity (*jivita-indriya*) does not by nature exist separately, being only conventionally established on the basis of being a state of the immediate seeds of root consciousness.

Mental capacity (*mana-indriya*) is by nature the eighth consciousness in general.

The five capacities of feeling (*vedanā-indriya*) have as their nature the five feelings [of indifference, etc.] themselves as is fitting [in relation to various consciousnesses].

The five capacities of faith, etc., have as their self-nature faith, etc., and good memory, etc.

The capacity of knowing the as-yet unknown (*anājñātam-ājñāsyāmi-iti-indriya*) has three states of substance. The first is the root state (*mūla-avasthā*), i.e., on the path of insight, with the exception of the final instant, because there is no longer anything unknown that is to be known. The second is the state of added effort; i.e., [the four aids to penetration, *nirvedha-bhāgiyā*, consisting of] heat, summits, patience, and supreme worldly dharmas, because they can directly attract and generate the [above] root state. The third is the state of equipment (*saṃbhāra-avasthā*); i.e., all roots of good, from the desire to produce definitely superior good dharmas in order to obtain the comprehension of truth (*satya-abhisamaya*), up to, but not yet conforming to, the aids to penetration, are called the “state of equipment,” because they are able indirectly to assist and produce the root state.

In these three states, the nature of this capacity consists of the five capacities of faith, etc., along with thought, delight, happiness, and indifference. The capacity of regret also exists in the state of added effort, etc., when one feels sad about subsequent superior dharmas [not yet realized], but it is not properly a root of good and therefore is usually not mentioned.

As for this capacity existing in the first three formless realms, this is because there is a possibility of cultivating this capacity on the side of the superior path of insight. Or one in the state of the two vehicles who turns toward the Great [Vehicle] in order to realize the emptiness of dharmas generates, prior to this state, the

41b purity of the emptiness of the person included in nine stages, because all these bodhisattvas have this capacity. The path of insight of bodhisattvas also contains this capacity, but it is said |to exist| only prior to the |ten| stages, because the time |of the path when it occurs| is hurried. The nine pure capacities one possesses, such as faith, are all of the name of the capacity of knowing, from the final moment of the initial path of insight up to the Diamond-like *Samādhi*. In those not yet free of desire, there is also the capacity of sorrow following the search of supreme liberation, but it is not properly speaking a root of good, so it is not discussed much.

The capacity of one who has understood (*ājñātāvi-indriya*) is of the nature of the nine pure capacities of the stage of post-learner. Although the purity of discursive contemplation exists at the peak of existence, still it is not clear and sharp and is not of the nature of the last three capacities. Such is the self-nature of the twenty-two capacities. The interpretation of other topics |related to them| should be understood in accordance with the [*Yogācārabhūmi*] *Śāstra*.

6. The Ten Causes

Because these |above| four conditions are distinguished on the basis of the concept of the fifteen foundations (*adhiṣṭhāna*), they constitute ten causes (*hetu*). How are they established on the basis of the fifteen foundations?

The first is the foundation consisting of speech (*vāc*); i.e., its nature is that of speech generated by dharmas, names, and concepts. The conformal-expression cause (*anuvyavahāra-hetu*) is established on the basis of this foundation |consisting of speech|. That is, because on the basis of this foundation and conforming to seeing, hearing, etc., one expresses various concepts. That which expresses is the cause of what is expressed. There is a treatise that says that this |foundation| is names, concepts, and views, because [expression] occurs in conformity to and resulting from naming things, grasping their characteristics, and becoming attached to their differences. If we follow this interpretation, then this cause [i.e., names, etc.] is the foundation of speech.

The second is the foundation consisting of feeling (*anubhava*); i.e., its nature is that of the feeling and that which is felt, which is that which is considered. The consideration cause (*apekṣā-hetu*) is established on the basis of this foundation. That is, in considering this [feeling], various events are made to be generated, sustained, achieved, and obtained, and this is the consideration cause of those [events].

The third is the foundation consisting of perfuming; i.e., internal and external seeds in an immature state. The projecting cause (*ākṣepa-hetu*) is established on the basis of this foundation, that is, because it is capable of projecting its own results distantly.

The fourth is the foundation consisting of fertilized seeds (*śasneha-bija*); i.e., internal and external seeds in the mature state. The productive cause is established on the basis of this foundation, that is, because it is able to produce its own results immediately.

The fifth is the foundation consisting of immediate cessation (*anantara-niruddha*); i.e., the similar and immediately antecedent condition [consisting] of mind and mental activities [that immediately cease upon the arising of subsequent states of mind, etc.].

The sixth is the foundation consisting of the objective realm (*viśaya*); i.e., the condition as object of mind and mental activities.

The seventh is the foundation consisting of the organs (*indriya*); i.e., the supporting six organs of mind and mental activities.

The eighth is the foundation consisting of activity (*kāraṇa*); i.e., the activity of the instrument of the action that is done. This consists of the remaining active conditions with the exception of the seeds.

The ninth is the foundation consisting of the activity of the doer (*puruṣa-kāra*); i.e., the activity of the doer of the action that is done. This consists of the remaining active conditions with the exception of the seeds. 41c

The tenth is the foundation consisting of true view (*tattva-darśana*); i.e., pure view. Excluding the attraction of its own seeds, it aids, attracts, and generates pure dharmas.

On the basis of these [above last] six [foundations] as a whole is established the assisting cause (*parigraha-hetu*); i.e., because five of the assisting [causes] provide impure dharmas and all six provide the pure [dharmas].

The eleventh is the foundation consisting of promotion (*anupratipatti*); i.e., various nondetermined, defiled, and good forces (*saṃskāra*), both as actual [dharmas] and as seeds, which are able to promote dharmas of the same species and those of a superior class. The attracting cause is established on the basis of this foundation, that is, because it is able to attract and generate superior forces of the same species, and it is able to attract and obtain unconditioned dharmas.

The twelfth is the foundation consisting of special power (*kāritra-viśeṣa*); i.e., the special power of conditioned dharmas that enables each to generate its own results. The particular cause (*pratiniyama-hetu*) is established on the basis of this foundation, that is, because each [conditioned dharma] is able to produce the result of its own [particular] realm, etc., and each is able to obtain the result of its own [particular] vehicle (*yāna*).

The thirteenth is the foundation consisting of union (*samāgri*); i.e., all foundations, from that of feeling up to that of special powers, that constitute a power of union with regard to generating, sustaining, perfecting, and obtaining results. The identical activity cause (*sahakāri-hetu*) is established on the basis of this foundation, that is, because all [causes], from that of contemplation up to that of the particular, have an identical activity of generating, etc.

The fourteenth is the foundation consisting of obstruction (*pratibandha*); i.e., those dharmas that are able to obstruct the events consisting of generating, sustaining, perfecting, and obtaining. The opposing cause (*virodha-hetu*) is established on the basis of this foundation, that is, because those [dharmas] can obstruct the events consisting of generating, etc.

The fifteenth is the foundation consisting of nonobstruction (*apratibandha*); i.e., dharmas that do not obstruct the events consisting of generating, sustaining, perfecting, and obtaining. The

nonopposing cause (*avirodha-hetu*) is established on the basis of this foundation, that is, because those [dharmas] do not obstruct the events of generating, etc.

These ten causes are categorized as two causes; the generating (*janaka-hetu*) and the instrumental (*upāya-hetu*).

The *Bodhisattvabhūmi* [*Śāstra*] says, “Projecting seeds and productive seeds are called ‘generating causes.’ All remaining causes are categorized as ‘instrumental causes.’” This says that of [six causes, consisting of] the projecting, productive, attracting, particular, identical activity, and nonobstructing, the seeds as conditions as cause in the immature state are called “projecting seeds,” and those in a mature state are called “generating seeds.” This is because among those six causes, all seeds that are conditions as cause are included in the two states [of maturity and immaturity].

[According to one interpretation,] although there are presently active [actual dharmas] that can generate [results and technically belong to the generating class of causes] and, like the four causes, produce their own seeds, still they are often interrupted and for that reason are omitted [in the statement of the above treatise]. Alternately [according to a second interpretation], they are given the name “seeds” [in that text] because they immediately produce fruit, just as one speaks of the seeds of actual grains, barley, etc.

The other causes—i.e., the first, second, fifth, and ninth, and those among the six causes that are not dharmas in the capacity of conditions as cause—are all other than seeds as conditions as cause that produce retribution, and therefore they are said to be categorized as instrumental causes. It is not that these two [kinds of] seeds belong only to those two [kinds of causes], because in four other causes there are seeds that are conditions as cause. It is not only those eight [excluding the projecting cause and productive cause] that are referred to as “remaining causes” [in the above treatise], because those two causes are seeds that are not conditions as cause. The *Savitarkabhūmi* [chapter of the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*], etc., say that the productive cause is the generating cause, while the others are categorized as instrumental. 42a

The meaning of this passage [in the *Savitarkabhūmi*] is that of the six causes that are conditions as cause, whether actual [dharmas] or seeds, all are called “productive causes,” because they immediately generate results of their own species. The remaining [four] are all categorized as “instrumental.” It is not that this productive [cause] belongs only to that [generating] cause, because there are conditions as cause among five other causes. Nor is it that only those nine [causes in the list of ten] are referred to as “remaining causes,” because in the [excluded] generating cause, there are [dharmas] that are not conditions as cause.

Or, [according to another interpretation,] the projecting and productive seeds spoken of in the *Bodhisattvabhūmi Śāstra* are the two causes [i.e., projecting and productive], and the “remaining causes” are the remaining eight. Even though within these two causes there are causes that are not generative, still the seeds that are conditions as cause are predominant and obvious, and for that reason [the text] says incorrectly [that they are generating causes]. Even though among the remaining causes there are causes that are not expedient, still those that are dominant [conditions] are numerous and obvious, and for that reason [that text] says incorrectly [that they are instrumental causes].

As for the *Savitarkabhūmi* [chapter] saying that the productive cause is the generating cause and the remaining [causes among the ten] are instrumental, the productive [cause] is the same as the productive cause [in the list of ten] and the “remaining causes,” you should understand, are the remaining nine [of the list of ten]. Even though in this productive [cause] there are seeds that are not conditions as cause, still they are proximate in bearing results and are obvious, and for that reason it is said incorrectly [that they are productive causes]. Even though in the projecting cause there are also seeds that are conditions as cause, still they are far away from bearing results, and the immediate seeds are obscure, and for that reason [the text] does not mention them [as generating causes]. The remaining [other eight causes] categorized as instrumental causes should be understood in the same way as the above.

On the basis of which foundations are the four conditions that we have discussed based? How do they include the ten causes and two causes?

The [*Yogācārabhūmi*] *Śāstra* says that the condition as cause is established on the basis of the seeds (*sasneha-bīja-adhiṣṭhāna*); the similar and immediately antecedent condition is established on the basis of immediate cessation (*anantara-niruddha-adhiṣṭhāna*); the condition as object is established on the basis of the objective realm (*viśaya-adhiṣṭhāna*); the dominant condition is established on the basis of the remaining [foundations].

Among these [conditions], the seeds of the six [foundations]—three, four, eleven, twelve, thirteen, and fifteen—are categorized as seeds as conditions as cause. Even though the foundations that are actual [dharmas] are also conditions as cause, still they are often interrupted, and [the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*] omits them without discussion. Or those are also referred to as seeds, because, like external grains, etc., they are capable of immediately accomplishing their own results. Or, [according to a different interpretation,] the word “seeds” pertains only to the fourth [foundation, the fertilized seeds], accepting the immediate and obvious and rejecting the distant and obscure as before.

With regard to the terms “foundation consisting of immediate cessation” and “foundation consisting of the objective realm,” you should understand that they indicate generally the foundations of the two conditions [similar and immediately antecedent condition and condition as object], not just the fifth and sixth foundations, because the remaining foundations also contain the meaning of the middle two conditions. Or [according to another interpretation] they are only the fifth and sixth [foundations]. Even though the other foundations have [the meaning of the two conditions], still they are omitted [from the definition] because they are few and obscure.

The [*Yogācārabhūmi*] *Śāstra* says that the condition as cause is categorized as the generating cause; the dominant condition is by nature the instrumental cause. The middle two conditions are

categorized as assisting causes. [However, although the instrumental cause is made up of the last three of the four conditions, still, because the dominant conditions are numerous, the above text speaks of them incorrectly as dominant conditions]. The remaining causes [other than instrumental causes] contain the middle two conditions; however, these two conditions are obvious as assisting causes, and for that reason the above text incorrectly speaks of them as assisting causes]. The categorization of the first [condition, i.e., cause] as the generating [cause] may be understood by analogy.

7. The Five Results

The causes and conditions that were discussed must have results. How many results are there, and on the basis of what foundations (*adhiṣṭhāna*) are they obtained?

There are five kinds of results (*phala*). The first is [result as] retribution (*vipāka-phala*), that is, the nondetermined [dharma] born of retribution in one's own continuity (*svasaṃtāna*) summoned by impure good and nongood dharmas.

The second is [the result that is] similar (*niṣyanda-phala*), that is [dharma] of the same species attracted by repeated good, etc., [karma], or [restated] the evolving of a subsequent result resembling a prior action.

The third is [the result of] disentanglement (*visaṃyoga-phala*), that is, good unconditioned dharmas realized by cutting off the obstacles to the pure path.

The fourth is [the result of] the operations of the person (*puruṣa-kāra-phala*), that is, operations transacted by various agents employing various implements.

The fifth is the [result that is] dominant (*adhipati-phala*), that is, the remaining results that are obtained, with the exception of the previous four.

According to the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* and others, the result as retribution is acquired through the foundation consisting of seeds; the similar result is acquired through the foundation consisting

of promotion; the result of disentanglement is acquired through the foundation consisting of true views; the result of the operations of the person is acquired through the foundation consisting of the operations of the person; and the dominant result is acquired through the remaining foundations.

The words “foundation that is perfuming” (*vāsanā-adhiṣṭhāna*) indicate all the energies (*śakti*) of various foundations that promote the result that is retribution. The words “foundation that is promotion” (*anupratipatti-adhiṣṭhāna*) indicate all the energies of various foundations that attract results that are similar. The words “foundation that is true view” (*tattva-darśana-adhiṣṭhāna*) indicate all the energies of various foundations that realize the result that is disentanglement. The words “foundation consisting of the operations of the person” (*puruṣa-kāra-adhiṣṭhāna*) indicate all the energies of various foundations that create the results of the operations of the person. The words “remaining foundations” indicate all the energies of various foundations that acquire dominant results. If [these correspondences] were other than this, they would necessarily be too loose or too restricted.

Or, [according to a divergent interpretation, the foundation consisting of] perfuming applies only to the third [foundation]. Even though cause as retribution also exists in other foundations, and although there are causes that are not retribution in this foundation, still cause as retribution is distant from its result, and the same is so of perfuming; and for that reason it can be said in a sense [that this foundation is the basis for the result that is retribution].

[The foundation consisting of] promotion applies only to the eleventh foundation. Even though the result that is similar is found in other foundations, and although results that are not similar are found in this foundation, still this cause summons the superior [dharmas], and its mode of activity is obvious; and for that reason it is said in a sense [that this foundation is the basis for the result that is similar].

The words “foundation consisting of true view” only explain the tenth [foundation]. Even though other foundations are also

able to realize disentanglement, and although this foundation is capable of realizing that which is not disentanglement, still its mode of activity of realizing disentanglement is obvious; and for that reason it is said in a sense [that it is the basis of the result consisting of disentanglement].

The words “foundation consisting of the operations of the person” only explain the ninth [foundation]. Even though the result of the operations of the person is summoned by other foundations, and although this foundation is capable of summoning the dominant result, etc., its name and mode of activity are obvious; and for that reason it is said in a sense [that it is the basis for the result of the operations of the person].

The [words] “other foundations” apply only to the remaining eleven [foundations]. Even though these eleven foundations acquire other results, and although other foundations are also capable of summoning the dominant result, still these eleven frequently summon the dominant [result], and the remainder manifest the others; and for that reason, it is said in a sense [that these foundations manifest the dominant result].

Of the five results so discussed, in the case of the result that is retribution, it is acquired by the projecting, productive, particular, identical activity, and nonopposing causes, along with the dominant condition. In the case of the result that is similar, it is acquired by the projecting, productive, assisting, attracting, particular, identical activity, and nonopposing causes, along with the condition as cause and the dominant condition. In the case of the result that is disentanglement, it is acquired by the assisting, attracting, particular, identical activity, and nonopposing causes, as well as the dominant condition. In the case of the results of the operations of the person, there is an interpretation that it is acquired by the contemplation, assisting, identical activity, and nonopposing causes, as well as the dominant condition. According to another interpretation, it is acquired by the contemplation, projecting, productive, assisting, attracting, particular, identical activity, and nonopposing causes, as well as the three conditions other than

the condition as object. In the case of the dominant result, it is possible for it to be acquired by all ten causes and four conditions. Now that we have examined this peripheral matter [of the five results], let us return to the proper matter [of conditionality].

8. Seeds and Actual Dharmas

The seeds in the root consciousness in their generation of actual imaginations may constitute three conditions, excluding the similar and immediately antecedent [condition]. That is, each parent seed is a condition as cause for that [which is its direct result]. It is a condition as object for that which has it as an object. If seeds have the power to help and do not obstruct [the results], they are dominant conditions. You should understand that this is also the case in their production of pure actual [dharmas].

Actual imaginations in their mutual assistance may constitute among themselves three conditions, because they are not conditions as cause. That is, different sentient beings may constitute two conditions for each other, excluding acting as similar and immediately antecedent [conditions]. Among the eight consciousnesses that constitute one's own group, they are definitely dominant conditions for each other, but they must not be similar and immediately antecedent conditions; but they may or may not be conditions as objects. The eighth [consciousness] may be [a condition as object] for the seventh, but the seventh is not for the eighth, and the remaining seven are not for the eighth, because they are not the essence on which it is based. The seventh is not [a condition as object] for the five [first] consciousnesses, but it is for the sixth. None of the remaining six are [conditions as objects] for the seventh. The sixth is not [a condition as object] for the [first] five, and the remaining five are for that [sixth], because the [first] five consciousnesses rely only on the images of the eighth.

In the succession of [consciousness of] the same species, the sixth may be three [kinds of conditions], but the other [seven] are not [conditions as] objects [for successors], because they grasp actual objects. As for [the opinion of Dignāga] that the subsequent

seeing [part] of the five [first consciousnesses] has as its object the prior image, the sequence of the five [consciousnesses] and the seventh constitute three conditions. [Also, according to Dignāga,] the prior seven may be objects for the eighth, because they can perfume and create the seeds of the seen and seeing [parts] of that [eighth consciousness].

[Dharmas of] the same group but of different substances are only dominant conditions among themselves, because the supporting essence of associated dharmas is the same and they do not have each other as objects.

Or, [according to Dignāga,] it is on the basis of the seeing part that it is said that they do not have each other as objects, and it is on the basis of the seen part that it is said that there is the meaning of having each other as objects. That is, the various seen parts arise with each other as essences, just as the seeds in the [store] consciousness are the essences for contact, etc., because if that is not so, they must be devoid of objects in the formless [realms]. Conceding that [consciousness] transforms into form, it definitely also has seeds as objects, because it may not be that the objects of the seeing part are not of a common essence.

Seen parts of the same substance act as two conditions for the seeing [part]. The seeing part is just the dominant [condition] for that [seen part]. The same is the case between the seeing [part] and the self-authenticating [part, i.e., the *svasaṃvitti-bhāga*]. In the mutual assistance of the remaining two [parts], they are two conditions for each other. In this matter, the explanation is not based on seeds as the seen and seeing parts, because we have been making the point that actual [dharmas] are conditions for each other.

The group of the eight consciousnesses when purified are all objects for each other in their mutual assistance, because they are all able to have all things as objects. Only the seeing part is excluded as not being an object for the seen [part], because the seen part in principle is devoid of the function of having objects. Since actual imaginations are born with both seeds and the actual

[dharmas] as objects, the seeds also, in principle, arise with actual [dharmas] and seeds as objects.

How many conditions can actual [dharmas] and seeds be for seeds? Seeds cannot arise from the middle two conditions [*sam-anantara* and *ālambana*] because these [two] are established in dependence on mind and mental activities. Actual dharmas altogether make two conditions for the immediate seeds, but they are only dominant conditions for seeds that are not immediate [in succession]. Two conditions altogether of seeds in relation to immediate seeds, but only the dominant condition for seeds that are not immediate. On the basis of the arising of an internal consciousness through mutual conditioning, there is a cause and result [structure] of the imaginations, as demonstrated by teachings and reason. Even granting that objects that are external [to mind], such as are grasped [by the Small Vehicle], really exist, they have no function. Even more, they contradict reason and teachings, so why be attached to them? 43a

Even though the term “imaginations” indicates in general mind and mental activities of the three realms, still a number of them are discussed in the holy teaching in accordance with their prominence—two, three, four, five, etc., as explained at length in other treatises.

Chapter IX

Birth and Death and the Three Habit Energies

Even though internal consciousness exists, still there are no external conditions, so what is the basis for the continuity of birth and death (*saṃsāra*) among sentient beings? [Vasubandhu's] verses say,

THE HABIT ENERGY OF VARIOUS ACTIONS
TOGETHER WITH THE HABIT ENERGY OF THE TWO GRASPINGS,
WHEN PRIOR RETRIBUTION IS EXHAUSTED,
SUBSEQUENTLY PRODUCE OTHER RETRIBUTION.

The Treatise says that VARIOUS ACTIONS (*karma*) means meritorious, unmeritorious, and unchanging, which is to say, impure good and bad volitional action. The name ACTION also applies to the retinue of action [i.e., the five aggregates], because they also summon and provide the result that is retribution. Even though [action] ceases immediately as soon as it occurs and cannot be admitted as having the ability to summon future results of retribution, yet it perfumes root consciousness and generates its own powers, and these powers are called HABIT ENERGY. They are the “vapors” of deeds created by perfuming. Past and present action are excluded, and for that reason [the verses] speak of HABIT ENERGY. This habit energy develops in a continuous series up to the time it becomes mature and summons the result that is retribution. This indicates the supreme dominant condition of the future result.

The grasping of the seen [part of consciousness] and the seeing [part], names and form, mind and mental activities, and root

and branches [as self and dharmas] is all categorized as the two GRASPINGS. The energies in root consciousness that have been perfumed [by the two graspings] and that can immediately produce those [same two graspings] are called HABIT ENERGY OF THE TWO GRASPINGS. This indicates that they are seeds in the capacity of conditions as cause for future mind and its associates as results as retribution. TOGETHER WITH means that the seeds of action together with the seeds of the two graspings, as remote and immediate [conditions respectively,] assist each other [to produce the result]. Because of the obviousness of action summoning birth, the verse mentions it first.

PRIOR RETRIBUTION means results as retribution for actions in previous lives. OTHER RETRIBUTION means results as retribution for action in later lives. Though the seeds of the two graspings experience results endlessly, still the habit energy of action experiences results and is then exhausted. The result as retribution is difficult to summon due to its difference in nature, but the similar and dominant [results] are easy to instigate, due to their being of the same nature [as their cause].

As a consequence of the maturity of the seeds of action, etc., that instigate other lives, when the enjoyment of results of previous retribution is exhausted, [the mature seeds] subsequently produce other results as retribution. Consequently, the wheel of birth and death is unending, so why imagine external conditions in order for there to be a continuous series [of lives]? The meaning of the above [verses] is that the turning of the wheel due to action and the two graspings does not occur apart from consciousness, because [cause and result] are by nature dharmas of mind and mental activities.

Next [there is another interpretation] that the continuous series of births and deaths is due to various habit energies (*vāsanā*), which are, in general, of three kinds. The first is habit energy of names and expressions, that is, the separate, immediate seeds of each conditioned dharma. Names and expressions are of two kinds. The first is names and expressions that express meaning, which is

43b

to say, different sounds that express meaning. The second kind is names and expressions that reveal objects, which is to say, mind and mental activities that perceive objects. The seeds that are created by perfuming through the two [kinds of] names and expressions constitute separate conditions as cause for each conditioned dharma.

The second [kind of habit energy] is habit energy of grasping a self (*ātma-grāha*), that is, the seeds of a false grasping of “I” and “mine.” Grasping a self is of two kinds. The first is an innate grasping of a self, which is to say, the grasping of a “self” and a “mine” that is to be eliminated by [the path of] cultivation. The second kind is the grasping of a self through imagination, which is to say, the grasping of a “self” and a “mine” that is to be eliminated by [the path of] insight. Seeds created by perfuming through the two kinds of grasping of a self cause the distinction of self and others among sentient beings, etc.

The third [kind of habit energy] is the habit energy of the cause of existence (*bhava-vāsanā*), that is, the seeds of action that summon retribution in the three realms. The cause of existence is twofold. The first is impure good [action], which is to say, action that is capable of summoning pleasurable results. The second consists of various nongood [actions], which is to say, actions that are capable of summoning nonpleasurable results. The seeds that are created by perfuming in accordance with the two [kinds of] causes of existence cause the difference between good and evil destinies as results as retribution.

You should understand that the habit energies of grasping a self and the cause of existence are dominant conditions for different results. When the Verses speak of HABIT ENERGY, this should be understood to mean the habit energy of the cause of existence. The words HABIT ENERGY OF THE TWO GRASPINGS in the verse should be understood as the habit energies of the two [kinds of seeds] of grasping a self and names and expressions. All are referred to as “graspings” because they are created by perfuming from grasping an “I” and “mine” and from grasping names and expressions. The

meaning of other passages such as TOGETHER WITH are as previously explained.

Next, [there is another interpretation] that the continuous series of births and deaths is a result of passions, actions (*karma*), and suffering (*duḥkha*). “Passions” are the passions [lit. “afflictions”] that produce action and nourish birth. “Actions” are various actions that are capable of summoning subsequent existences. “Suffering” is the mass of suffering attracted and generated by action. The seeds of passions, actions, and suffering are all called “habit energy.”

The first two habit energies [of passions and actions] are dominant conditions for the suffering of birth and death, because they help produce suffering. The third habit energy [of suffering] is capable of acting as the condition as cause for birth and death, because it immediately produces suffering. The three habit energies of the verses should be understood accordingly. Passions and suffering are called “graspings” because they are [respectively] the grasper and the grasped. “Grasping” has the meaning of “attachment,” so action is not so named. The meaning of other passages such as TOGETHER WITH are as previously explained.

It should be understood that these passions, actions, and suffering are wholly included in the twelve members of existence; i.e., from ignorance up through birth and death, as explained at length in the treatise.

1. The Twelve Members of Conditioned Arising

The twelve members (*aṅga*) can be reduced to four. The first are those members that project (*ākṣepaka*), that is, ignorance and the karmic forces (*saṃskāra*), because they are able to project the seeds of the five results consisting of consciousness, etc. Of these, ignorance is considered to be only that which can give rise to good and bad action that directly summons subsequent lives. “Karmic forces” is the name given to those that are produced by that [ignorance]. Consequently, none of the actions [whose results] are experienced in the present life nor those actions that aid in [the generation of] future [recompense] are this member, karmic forces.

43c

The second [kind] consists of that which is projected (*ākṣipta*), that is, the seeds in root consciousness that immediately generate future results as retribution, which include the seeds of consciousness, etc., because they are projected and produced by the former two members. Here, “seeds of consciousness” refers to the cause of root consciousness. The remaining causes, excluding the last three causes, are all categorized as seeds of name-and-form, and the last three causes are the last three [kinds of] seeds, such as the sequence of name [and form].

Or, the seeds of name-and-form generally indicate five causes, and the other four [kinds of seeds] are established according to their predominance. The six sense bases (*ṣaḍ-āyatana*) and consciousness (*viññāna*) refer generally to the six consciousnesses and specifically to the mental sense field (*mano-dhātu*) respectively.

The *Abhidharmasamuccaya* says that consciousness also projects, because the seeds of action in consciousness are named “consciousness member” (*viññāna-aṅga*) and because the seeds of consciousness as retribution are categorized as name-and-form. A scripture says that the member of consciousness is both the projecting and the projected, because both seeds of action and seeds of consciousness are called “consciousness,” and because consciousness is the support of name-and-form and not categorized as name-and-form.

Even though the perfuming and production through action as a result of the five seeds of consciousness, etc., is really simultaneous, still due to their different characteristics as ruler [in the case of consciousness] and retinue [in the case of name-and-form, six sense bases, contact, and feeling], general and specific [respectively], superior and inferior, and cause and result, some holy teachings say hypothetically that there is a sequence [instead of simultaneity]. Or it is said that there is a sequence because there is a sequence in their future actual state. As a consequence of this, it is said that consciousnesses, etc., are actually active, because then they are causes [as seeds], they are definitely devoid of the meaning of actual activity. Moreover, as a consequence of this, it

is said that engendering and projecting are simultaneous, because the occasions when [the seeds] are nourished or not nourished are not simultaneous.

The third [kind of member] is that which engenders (*jānaka*), that is, thirst (*tṛṣṇā*), grasping (*upādāna*), and becoming (*bhāva*), because they directly engender future birth, old age, and death. That is, in dependence on the delusion of being confused about internal results as retribution, actions in the form of conditions are produced that are able to summon subsequent lives at once, and the seeds of the five results are projected and immediately generate the state of birth and death of future lives.

Again, due to the delusion of being confused about external dominant results [i.e., objects] and conditioned by experience of the external realm, thirst is produced, and conditioned by thirst the four [kinds of] grasping, such as [grasping of] desire, are born. Thirst and grasping combine and nourish the seeds of action that project, along with the projected causes, to be renamed “becoming,” because together they are able to have immediate results in the form of subsequent lives.

There is a source that just says that the seeds of action are called “becoming,” because they can directly instigate the result as retribution. There is another source that just says that the five seeds [of the five members beginning with consciousness] are named “becoming,” because they immediately generate seeds of future consciousness, etc.

The fourth [kind of member] consists of those that are engendered (*jānya*), that is, birth (*jāti*) and old age and death (*jarā-maraṇa*), because they are directly engendered by thirst, grasping, and becoming. That is, everything from the intermediate existence (*antarā-bhava*) up to the basic existence, as long as there is no deterioration, is called “birth.” Old age is the general name for the state of deterioration, and the name “death” is given to the deterioration of the body and the end of life.

Old age does not definitely exist, so why is it attached to death to form a member? Why is illness not a member? Because it is not

universal or necessary [for causing rebirth]. Even though old age is not necessary, it is universal, and for that reason it constitutes a member, because, with the exception of premature death, [all beings in] the various realms, destinies, and forms of birth have decaying forces.

Name-and-form are not universal. Why does it constitute a member? It is a member because it is necessary, because those born from wombs, eggs, and moisture must have name-and-form as long as their six sense bases are incomplete. Also, the member of name-and-form is universal. Even though beings in [the realm of] form and those who are miraculously born have the five [sense] organs when they first experience birth, still [the organs] do not yet function, and so at that time, they are not called “six sense bases.” Even though [beings] definitely have the mental faculty when first born in the formless realm, still it does not perceive clearly, so it is not called a “mental sense base.” As a consequence of this, the [Yogācārabhūmi] Śāstra says, “The twelve members all exist in part in the two upper realms.” 44a

Thirst does not exist universally. Why does it separately constitute a member? Because the one born in an evil destiny does not thirst for it. It is necessary, and for that reason it separately constitutes a member, because one born in good destinies who does not seek nonexistence definitely has thirst, and because even though the nonreturners do not have the occurrence of the thirst that nourishes rebirth, still just as they [still] grasp, they definitely have the seeds [of thirst]. Also, thirst is universal, because those born in the evil destinies still have thirst for their present selves and for objects. Due to their not having thirst that seeks a body in the evil destinies, it is said by the scriptures that [thirst] does not exist, but it is not completely nonexistent.

What is the reason for establishing birth and old age as that which is engendered and separately establishing the five members of consciousness, etc., as that which is projected? Because in the causal state, specific characteristics are difficult to know, the five members [of consciousness, etc.] are separately established on

the basis of their future results. That is, at the time of the first appearance of consciousness at rebirth, the characteristics of causal consciousness are manifest. Next, the organs are still incomplete, and the characteristics of name-and-form grow. Next, when the organs are complete, the six sense bases are clear and thriving. As a consequence, contact appears, and because of contact, feeling occurs, and at that time it is said that the result of feeling is completed. On the basis of the states of result, causes are established as being five in number.

Because the distinct characteristics of the states of result are easy to understand, the two members [of birth and old age and death] are established generally in order to indicate the three [kinds of suffering]. However, when the result that is projected is in the future, it is said to be birth and old age and death in order to generate disgust. When it is in the present, it is said to be the five [members] of consciousness, etc., in order to bring about a clear understanding of the generation of the characteristics of the state.

What is the reason for generally establishing ignorance for the production of action and separately establishing thirst and grasping for the state of nourishing action? Even though various passions are capable of producing and nourishing, still the power of ignorance is predominant in the state of producing action, because it has eleven particularities, such as its objects, etc., as extensively discussed in the scriptures. Regarding the state of nourishing action, the power of thirst is especially predominant, because it is said that thirst, like water, can enrich.

In order for becoming to sprout, it must be watered repeatedly, and the two members of thirst and grasping are distinguished on the basis of the preliminary and subsequent parts [of the watering process]. The one [cause of action] of ignorance is established; then there is no meaning of production through repetition. Even though all passions are included in the member of grasping, still thirst is predominant in nourishing, and [grasping] is said to be the intensification of thirst.

All members of conditioned arising are supported by their own

stages, but some karmic forces that are produced are supported by the ignorance of another [stage], just as the inferior ignorance produces the karmic forces of a superior stage. If it were otherwise, when one first subdued the impurity of a lower stage, the superior *samādhi* that had arisen would not be the member of the karmic forces, because the ignorance of that stage had not yet arisen.

When one is born in a lower stage from an upper one, or vice versa, on the basis of what feeling does one generate the member of thirst? That thirst is based on the feeling of the future stage of birth, whether actual or as seeds, which does not conflict with reason. 44b

These twelve members—the ten causes and two results—are not necessarily of the same period. Of the [ten] causes, the first seven, along with thirst, grasping, and becoming, are sometimes of different [periods] and sometimes of the same. They are necessarily of the same period in the case of [the last] two, the [middle] three, and the [first] seven. In this way, a single repetition of cause and result in the twelve [members] sufficiently shows the turning of the wheel [of death and rebirth] and avoids annihilationism and eternalism. There is really no need to devise a double repetition [as the Small Vehicle does], or else one would have to go beyond those [two] and they would be extended endlessly [in infinite regress].

2. Related Topics

On the topic of the differences of meanings of the twelve members, nine are real and three are fictional, because the combined nourished six members [i.e., ignorance and the five beginning with consciousness] are becoming, and the five beginning with consciousness in the three states [of origination, change, and cessation] are separately named “birth,” etc.

Five are single entities; that is, the five of ignorance, consciousness, contact, feeling, and thirst. The others are not single [but are composites].

Three are defiled only, because they are passions by nature, and seven are nondefiled only, because they are results as retribution.

Because defilement may occur in seven states, it is said hypothetically that they are both [defiled and nondefiled]. The rest are of both kinds.

Ignorance, thirst, and grasping are said to be characterized by solitariness, because they are not mixed with characteristics of other members. The remainder are characterized by mixture.

Six are nonmaterial only; that is, ignorance, consciousness, contact, feeling, thirst, and grasping. The others are both.

All are categorized as impure and conditioned only, because pure and unconditioned [dharmas] are not members.

Ignorance, thirst, and grasping are not good and defiled and nondetermined only. Karmic forces are good and bad only. Becoming is both good and bad, undefiled and nondetermined. The other seven are only nondefiled and nondetermined, and during the seven states, good or defiled [dharmas] also occur.

Even though all [members] are common to the three realms, still some are in part and some are wholly.

The member that is karmic forces of a superior stage is capable of subduing that of a lower stage, which is to say, the six kinds of mode of activity consisting of coarseness, suffering, etc., because there is a search for birth in the superior [stages] and a generation of that [member].

None [of the members] is generated by those who are learners or post-learners. Impure good actions performed by the saints are conditioned by special knowledge (*vidyā*) and are opposed to the member of becoming, and for that reason they are not categorized as the member of becoming. Consequently, you should understand that the saints necessarily do not perform or summon actions [leading to] subsequent lives, because they do not delusively seek the results of suffering in subsequent lives. [Nonreturners] assist old actions of the lower [stages] via mixed cultivation of the trance states (*dhyāna*) and [consequently] are born in the [celestial realms of the] Pure Abodes, etc., so there is no conflict with reason.

There is an interpretation that ignorance is eliminated only by [the path of] insight, because one must be confused about the [four] truths in order for karmic forces to be produced, and because

the saints do not perform actions [leading to] subsequent lives. The two members of thirst and grasping are eliminated only by [the path of] cultivation, because craving and seeking future lives nourishes becoming, and because the nine forms of death consciousness are accompanied by innate thirst. The remaining nine [members] are eliminated by [the paths of] both insight and cultivation.

There is an interpretation that all [members] are eliminated by the two [paths], because the [*Yogācārabhūmi*] *Śāstra* says, “[He with] the result called ‘Entering the Stream’ (*srota-āpanna*) has already eliminated all causes of becoming in part but not wholly.” If [the cause] of ignorance is eliminated only by insight, why is it said that he has not wholly eliminated it? If the [causes that are] thirst and grasping are eliminated only by cultivation, why is it said that he has eliminated all causes in part?

44c

Also, it is said that all passions of all realms are capable of binding birth. Only passions generated by imagination (*vikalpa*) are able to elicit karmic forces [leading to] going to evil destinies. [The *Yogācārabhūmi*] does not say that [passions] that nourish birth are eliminated only by cultivation and that karmic forces that summon subsequent lives are all produced by [passions] that are to be eliminated by insight. Consequently, you should understand that the three members of ignorance, thirst, and grasping are eliminated by both insight and cultivation.

However, the member of ignorance, which principally provokes the karmic forces, is to be eliminated by [the path of] insight, and as an assisting element it is not limited [to that elimination]. The two members of thirst and grasping, as principally nourishing birth, are to be eliminated only by [the path of] cultivation, and as assisting elements they are not limited [to that elimination].

Also, the self-nature of defiled dharmas must be eliminated, because when the antidote [of pure dharmas] is generated, they are eternally eliminated. None of the impure, nondefiled dharmas is to be eliminated in its self-nature, because it does not contradict the path. However, there are two interpretations that say that they are eliminated. The first is because of the elimination of bonds, that is, the elimination of passions that have [these dharmas] as objects and

that are mixed with them. The second is because of nongeneration, that is, eliminating the supports and causing their eternal nongeneration. On the basis of the elimination by separation from bonds, it is said that impure good and nondefiled and nondetermined [dharmas] are eliminated by cultivation only. On the basis of elimination by nongeneration, it is said that the evil destinies, mindless *samādhī*, etc., are eliminated by insight only. Regarding the statement that the twelve members are eliminated by both [paths], this should be understood as is appropriate in the above eliminations.

Ten [members] are accompanied by happiness and indifference, because feeling is not associated with [the member of] feeling, and for the most part there is no happiness or adventitious indifference in states of old age and death. Eleven [members] are accompanied by suffering, because they do not accompany feeling.

Eleven [members] are categorized as partially the suffering of deterioration (*pariṇāma-duḥkha*), but old age and death is not said to be, because in that state there is no feeling of pleasure for the most part, and deterioration is based on happiness. Twelve [members] are categorized as partially the suffering of suffering (*duḥkha-duḥkhatā*), because in all members there is a feeling of suffering. Twelve are categorized as totally the suffering of the karmic forces (*saṃskāra-duḥkha*), because all impure dharmas are totally the suffering of the karmic forces. Eleven are in part [categorized as the latter] due to indifference, excluding the member of old age and death, as was said of the suffering of deterioration. Such is the true interpretation. What was said by various holy teachings is not definite due to the addition of characteristics [of the members].

All [members] are categorized as the truth of suffering, because they are by nature the aggregates that are grasped. Five are also categorized as the truth of the origin [of suffering], because they are by nature actions or passions.

The various members definitely are dominant [conditions] for each other. The remaining three conditions may or may not be and are not fixed. According to scripture, there is only one [condition], due to its definiteness. There is the meaning of condition as cause in the relation of thirst to grasping and of becoming to birth.

When it is said that the member of consciousness [consists of] the seeds of action, the karmic forces are a condition as cause for consciousness. The remaining members are devoid of the meaning of condition as cause between them.

Still, as for the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* saying that ignorance is a condition as cause for the karmic forces, this is said on the basis of habit energy from action at the time of ignorance. Because it accompanies ignorance, it is said hypothetically that it is ignorance, but in reality it is the seeds of karmic forces. As for the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra* saying that the various members are not conditions as cause among themselves, this is said on the basis of actual thirst and grasping being only action.

45a

The other two conditions [immediately antecedent condition (*samanantara-pratyaya*) and condition in the form of an object (*ālambana-pratyaya*)] exist between ignorance and the karmic forces, thirst and grasping, and birth and old age and death. Becoming is not a similar and immediately antecedent condition for birth but is its condition as object, and feeling is not the similar and immediately antecedent condition for thirst but is its condition as object. The remaining members are neither [of the latter two conditions] among themselves.

This is the true explanation of conditioned arising on the basis of direct succession [of the twelve members], their natural order, and their nonmixture. When we consider them as conditions among themselves in a different manner, they become indefinite. The wise should consider them in accordance with reason.

Regarding the three of passion, action, and suffering including the twelve [members], ignorance, thirst, and grasping are categorized as passion. Karmic forces and a part of becoming are categorized as action. [The remaining] seven and a part of becoming are categorized as suffering. Some sources say that action completely includes becoming, and it should be understood that this is based on the becoming of action. Some sources say that consciousness is categorized as action. This is said because the seeds of action are the consciousness member. As for the name, “suffering” being given to only those [members] that are summoned by passions and

action, this is because they are categorized as the truth of suffering and the claim is made in order to induce disgust. As a result of passion, action, and suffering being the twelve members, they are able to cause the continuous series of births and deaths.

Next, the continuous series of births and deaths result from internal causes and conditions and do not require external conditions. Therefore there is only consciousness. “Cause” means impure and pure actions. These are said to be causes because they directly instigate birth and death. “Conditions” means the two obstacles consisting of the obstacle of the passions and the obstacle to that which is to be known. These are said to be conditions because they assist in instigating birth and death. What is the reason for this?

Birth and death are of two kinds. The first is limited birth and death (*pariccheda-jarā-maraṇa*), that is, coarse results as retribution among the three realms instigated by various impure good and bad actions and assisted by the power of the condition that is the obstacle of the passions. It is named “limited birth and death” because the longevity of body and life is definitely limited in accordance with the power of causes and conditions.

The second is birth and death by inconceivable transformation (*pariṇāmiki-jarā-maraṇa*), that is, specially powerful and subtle results as retribution that are instigated by pure, discriminating action, assisted by the power of the condition that is the obstacle to that which is to be known. It is named “transformation” because due to the power of compassionate vows, transformed bodies and lives are devoid of specific limitations. It is called “inconceivable” because its marvellous functioning, directly assisted and instigated by pure *samādhi* and vows, is impossible to fathom.

Alternately, [this last body] is named “body made of mind” [*manomaya-kāya*], because it is created to conform to the vows of mind. A scripture says, “Just as, with grasping as condition and impure actions as cause, one who is bound to rebirth is born in the three [realms of] existence, so, with repeated stages of ignorance as condition and pure actions as cause, there are arhats, *pratyekabuddhas*, and bodhisattvas who have obtained mastery who produce three kinds of body made of mind.”

It is also called a “transformation body” (*nirmāṇa-kāya*), because the power of pure *samādhi* turns it into something different from the original [body], resembling a [magical] transformation. A treatise says, “How can disciples who are post-learners (*śaikṣa-srāvaka*) who have [by definition] forever terminated subsequent lives realize the supreme *bodhi*? They achieve the supreme *bodhi* with a transformation body, not with a body that is the retribution of action.” Therefore there is no conflict with reason.

If the obstacle to that which is to be known, by assisting pure action, is able to instigate birth and death, those of the two vehicles of a fixed class (*gotra*) must never eternally enter *nirvāṇa* without remainder, because they are like ordinary beings detained by passion [because they retain the obstacle to that which is to be known]. [Also,] how can the truth of the path really instigate suffering? [We reply,] who says that it really instigates it? [It is asked,] in that case, how [can you speak of it as instigating]? [We reply,] pure *samādhi* and vows assisting impure action cause the results that are obtained to continue in a series for a long time and develop and increase in power, and this is conventionally referred to as “instigating.” In this way, at the time [impure acts] instigate [results,] it is a result of the assisting power of the condition of the obstacle to that which is to be known assisting them. [Actions] alone cannot instigate them. However [in reply to the first question], the obstacle to that which is to be known does not obstruct liberation, because it is devoid of the function of being able to produce actions and nourish birth. 45b

What function is performed by assisting the instigation of birth and death [by the bodhisattva]? It is in order to realize *bodhi* for oneself and to benefit and give happiness to others. That is, *pratyekabuddhas* and disciples of unfixed class, and bodhisattvas of great vows who have obtained mastery, have already eliminated or subdued the obstacle of the passions, and therefore it is not possible for them to receive again a future limited body. Fearful of wasting the long time they cultivated bodhisattva practices, they thereupon use the power of vows and pure, superior *samādhi*, just as the life-prolonging dharmas [of arhats] are the cause of

preserving their present bodies, and prevent the results from being terminated for a long time. In this way, over and over, their *samādhi* and vows assist them up to the time of the realization of supreme *bodhi*.

Again [it is asked,] why must [saints] depend on the assistance of the obstacle to that which is to be known? Since they have not yet perfectly realized the great compassion (*mahā-karuṇā*) of imageless knowledge, if they did not grasp *bodhi* and sentient beings as really existing, they would not generate an intense compassion and vows. Also, the obstacle to that which is to be known obstructs great *bodhi*, so they preserve their bodies and endure for a long time in order to eliminate [the obstacle]. Also, the obstacle to that which is to be known is the support of impure [dharma]. If this obstacle did not exist, that [support] would definitely be nonexistent, and for that reason it is a great assisting power for the preservation of life.

The preserved body that is assisted by impure vows and *samādhi* is categorized as a limited body, because it is an object of knowledge on the part of [the saints of] the two vehicles and ordinary beings. That which is assisted by pure *samādhi* and vows is categorized as a transformation body, because it is not an object [for the two vehicles, etc.]. Consequently, it should be understood that birth and death through transformation is by nature categorized as the impure result of retribution and the dominant result of pure actions. When it is said in certain holy teachings that [this result] is pure and transcends the three realms, they speak with reference to its assisting cause.

The expression HABIT ENERGY OF VARIOUS ACTIONS in the verses [of Vasubandhu] refers to the two [kinds of] seeds of action referred to earlier. HABIT ENERGY OF THE TWO GRASPINGS refers to the seeds of the two obstacles referred to earlier, because both are grasping. The meaning of the other passages such as TOGETHER WITH is as explained earlier. Even though there is no limitation in birth and death of transformation, one retribution is exhausted and another is born in succession. Still there is evolution from a former

to a subsequent [life] by means of repeated assistance [in the form of good actions], and there is an end to the prior and the birth of the subsequent [life].

Even though the continuous series of births and deaths is also a result of actual [dharmas], still there is no doubt that the seeds exist, so the verses speak of them in a partial manner. Alternately, [the verses] do not mention actual [dharmas] in order to show that none of the true causes and results of retribution are separate from root consciousness. Actual [dharmas] are the cause of retribution but do not occur with the results, because the evolving consciousness [or actual dharmas] are interrupted and are not retribution. The turning of the wheel of birth and death through former, present, and future times does not require external conditions, since it results from internal consciousness.

It should be understood that it is the same for the continuous series of pure dharmas. That is, from beginningless time there have existed pure seeds supported by root consciousness, and as a result of being perfumed and produced over and over by the evolving consciousness, etc., they gradually increase in strength right up to the time of the final achievement of Buddhahood. Having been transformed by the abandonment of the original impure seeds in consciousness and having been transformed by the acquisition of newly originating pure seeds and consciousness, and bearing the seeds of all merits, [the consciousness of a Buddha,] as a result of the power of the original vows, generates marvellous functioning eternally, continuing endlessly. 45c

As a result of this, you should know that there is only internal consciousness.

Chapter X

The Three Natures

If there is only consciousness, why did the World-Honored One say in place after place in the scriptures that there are three natures (*trisvabhāva*)? You should know that the three natures are also not separate from consciousness. Why? The verses [of Vasubandhu] say,

BECAUSE OF WHATEVER IMAGINATION,
SUCH-AND-SUCH A THING IS IMAGINED.
THE IMAGINED NATURE
DOES NOT EXIST.
THE NATURE THAT IS DEPENDENT ON OTHERS
IS DISCRIMINATION BORN OF CONDITIONS.
THE PERFECTED IS THE ETERNAL PRIVATION
OF THIS [DEPENDENT] NATURE FROM THAT FORMER
[IMAGINED NATURE].
THEREFORE, THIS AND THE DEPENDENT ON OTHERS
ARE NEITHER DIFFERENT NOR NONDIFFERENT,
LIKE THE NATURE OF IMPERMANENCE, ETC.
ONE NOT PERCEIVED, THE OTHER IS NOT PERCEIVED.

[According to Nanda,] the Treatise says that it is called IMAGINATION [lit. “universal conjecture”] because it conjectures comprehensively. Being of various and numerous kinds, [the verses] say WHATEVER. That is, it imagines comprehensively and falsely imagines. As a result of WHATEVER false imaginations, it imagines SUCH AND SUCH IMAGINED THINGS; that is, various natures of aggregates, sense bases, and sense fields, etc., that are falsely grasped as selves or dharmas. These various falsely grasped natures are all given the general name of “imagined nature” (*parikalpita-svabhāva*).

Such natures are absolutely nonexistent, because they cannot be found through a minute investigation of either scripture or reason.

Alternately, [according to Dharmapāla], the first quarter of the [first] verse shows the consciousness that imagines, and the second quarter shows the things that are imagined. The last half [of the first verse] then proceeds to state that the nature that is imagined, whether as a self or as dharmas, is nonexistent, because it has already been explained extensively that it cannot be found.

What is the nature of that which imagines? There is an interpretation [by Sthiramati] that all eight consciousnesses and their mental activities categorized as impure are able to imagine [for the following reasons]: because they are by nature false imagination; they all appear resembling the grasped and the grasper; and it is said that the *ālaya* [consciousness] has as its objects the falsely grasped seeds of the imagined nature.

There is an interpretation [by Dharmapāla] that the classes of the sixth and seventh consciousness grasp selves and dharmas and can imagine [for the following reasons]: because it is only said that mental consciousness can imagine; [both] mind [*manas*] and mental consciousness are referred to as “mental consciousness”; conjecture and discrimination can imagine, the grasping of selves and dharmas is necessarily discernment [which is absent in the store consciousness]; the twofold grasping is necessarily accompanied by ignorance; it is not claimed that ignorance has a good nature; delusion and nondelusion, etc., are not associated; we do not perceive that possessing grasping leads to the knowledge of emptiness; grasping existence and grasping nonexistence do not occur together; and that which does not grasp [i.e., *ālaya*] is unable to perfume.

Because minds that are impure, etc., do not realize reality, all are named “false imagination.” Even though they appear resembling that which is grasped (*grāhya*) and that which grasps (*grāhaka*), nevertheless not all can be categorized as imagination, because it must not be that pure minds also have grasping, because subsequently acquired [knowledge] of a Tathāgata would have grasping,

because a scripture says that Buddha knowledge manifests numerous images such as bodies and lands, in the same way a mirror does, etc. If [this knowledge] has no function of having objects, it must not be knowledge, etc.

Although it is said that store consciousness has as objects the seeds of imagination, still it is not said that it only [has that function], so that is not a conclusive piece of evidence. The consequence of this reasoning is that only the classes of the sixth and seventh [kinds of] minds have imagination. Although there are only two of these classes of consciousness, still there are two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, etc., imaginations, and they are not the same, and for that reason [the verses] speak of WHATEVER.

Next, what is the nature of that which is imagined? The *Mahāyānasamgraha* says that it is that which is dependent on others, because it is the condition as object for the imagining mind, etc. Why is the perfected nature not the objective realm of that [imagination]? Because reality is not the objective realm for false grasping. [But,] it is said to be imagined on the basis of its development [from false imagination]. Even though the imagined [nature] is the object of that [false imagination], still it is not its condition as object; therefore, it is not [really] grasped.

What are the characteristics of the imagined, and how does it differ from the dependent on others? There is an interpretation [by Sthiramati] that, due to beginningless false perfuming, mind and mental activities of the three realms are born resembling two [parts], even though each is unitary in substance, that is, as the seeing and seen parts, which is to say, the grasper and the grasped. Such two parts exist according to opinion but not according to reason. This characteristic is said to be imagined.

The supporting substance of the two [parts] is real and is born in dependence on conditions. This nature is not nonexistent and is called “dependent on others” because it is born from the condition of false imagination. How do we know that this is so? Various holy teachings say that false imagination is the dependent on others and the name of the twofold grasping is “imagined.”

There is an interpretation [by Dharmapāla] that the two parts that are transformation of all consciousnesses and mental activities via the power of perfuming are born of conditions and therefore are also the dependent on others. It is only when imagination, on the basis of this, falsely grasps them as definitely real existence and nonexistence, sameness and difference, both [of the latter two alternatives] and neither [of the alternatives], etc., that these two [parts] are named “imagined,” because various holy teachings say that only means of knowledge, only the two [parts, i.e., seeing and seen], and only the variety [of modes of each] are named [dependent on others].

Also, four dharmas, such as the image, and eleven consciousnesses, etc., are categorized as the dependent on others, according to all treatises. If it were otherwise, the two parts of the class of pure subsequently acquired knowledge must be “imagined.” If you admit that they are, holy knowledge will not be born with [seen parts as] objects. If it has them as objects, then this class of knowledge must not be [related to] the truth of the path. If you do not admit it, then you must understand that it will be the same for impure [consciousness].

46b

Also, if the two parts are the imagined [nature], then they must be like the horns of a rabbit, etc., and not the condition as object, because the substance of the imagined does not exist. Also, the two parts must not create and perfume seeds, and the birth of subsequent consciousnesses, etc., must be devoid of the two parts.

Also, the various habit energies are categorized as the seen part. How can nonexistent dharmas act as conditions as cause?

If internal seen and seeing parts born of conditions are not dependent on others, then the body of the two [parts] must not be either, because they do not have different causes.

The consequence of this line of reasoning is that the substance of mind and mental activities born of a host of conditions, along with the seen and seeing parts, whether impure or pure, are all the dependent on others, because they are able to arise in dependence on a host of conditions.

When the verses say DISCRIMINATION BORN OF CONDITIONS, it must be understood that this is just said of the defiled part of the dependent on others, because the pure part of the dependent on others is also the perfected (*pariniṣpanna*). Or, the various dharmas consisting of defiled and pure mind and mental activities are all called DISCRIMINATION [in the verses], because they are capable of having objects and they perceive. Hence all defiled and pure dependent on others is categorized here [in the verses] as dependent on others.

The perfect, complete, real nature of all dharmas as revealed by the twofold emptiness is named PERFECTED. [Its name] shows its universality, eternality, and the nonfalseness of its substance. This excludes specific and common characteristics, space, self, etc. [from the definition]. Pure, conditioned [mind] apart from error is ultimate and its superior functioning is universal, and so it also has this name [of “perfected”]. However, at present, the verses are referring to the first [kind of perfected nature], not the second one.

Its nature is the eternal privation of the former imagined [nature] from that [nature] which is dependent on others, the ultimate reality revealed by the twofold emptiness. When the verses say [PRIVATION] OF THAT, it indicates that the perfected and dependent on others are neither the same nor different. The words ETERNAL PRIVATION indicate that the falsely grasped natures of the grasper and the grasped in reality never existed. The meaning of the word FORMER shows that [the perfected nature] is not empty of the dependent on others. NATURE indicates that the twofold emptiness is not the perfected [nature], because ultimate reality is divorced from existence and divorced from nonexistence by nature.

As a consequence of the above reasoning, this perfected [nature] and [the nature that is] dependent on others are NEITHER DIFFERENT NOR NONDIFFERENT: if they were different, ultimate reality would not be the real nature of that [dependent on others]; if they were nondifferent, this [perfected] nature would be noneternal. Both [natures] would be both pure and impure realms, and then the functions of basic knowledge and subsequently acquired knowledge would be devoid of difference.

Why are the two natures neither different nor the same? They are LIKE THE NATURE OF IMPERMANENCE, so no self, etc. If the nature of impermanence, etc., is different from dharmas [that are impermanent] such as the karmic forces, these dharmas would not be impermanent, etc. If they are not different, [impermanence, etc.] would not be their common characteristics (*sāmānya-lakṣaṇa*). Consequently, the comparison shows that the perfected and dependent on others are neither the same nor different. This must be the principle concerning dharmas and the nature of dharmas (*dharmatā*), because the ultimate [truth] and the relative [truth] exist through mutual support.

[The verses say,] ONE [that is perfected] NOT PERCEIVED, THE OTHER [that is dependent on others] IS NOT PERCEIVED, because if one has not yet grasped the emptiness of the discriminated nature, one does not truly know the existence of the dependent on others. Once nondiscriminating knowledge realizes ultimate reality, one can thoroughly grasp, in subsequently acquired knowledge, that the nature that is dependent on others is like an illusion, etc.

46c Even though from beginningless time the dharmas of mind and mental activities have been able to have as objects their own seen and seeing parts, etc., still they have always been accompanied by the grasping of self and dharmas, and therefore they do not truly know that selves and dharmas are false transformations of mind and mental activities themselves that have been attracted by a host of conditions. They are nonexistent but appear to exist, like illusions, mirages, things in dreams, images in a mirror, echoes in a valley, the moon [reflected] in water, and the effects of conjuring. On the basis of this interpretation, a verse says:

One who does not see ultimate reality
Is unable to see the karmic forces.
All are like illusions, etc., that,
Although existing, are not real.

The meaning of this is that the three kinds of nature are inseparable from the dharmas of mind and mental activities. That is,

because mind and mental activities together with the actual transformation are born from a host of conditions, they are like illusions, etc., that are nonexistent, although they appear to exist and delude the ignorant. All are named “the nature that is dependent on others.”

The ignorant perversely grasp them as selves and dharmas, as existing or not existing, the same or different, both [the same and different], or neither [the same nor different], etc. Like flowers seen in the sky [by one with eye disease], etc., they are [in reality] totally nonexistent in nature and characteristics. All of this is named “discriminated [nature].” The self and dharmas that are grasped falsely in the dependent on others are both empty, and the real nature of consciousness, etc., revealed by this emptiness is named “the perfected [nature].” Therefore the three [natures] are not apart from mind, etc.

1. The Three Natures: Various Topics

In what natures are space (*ākāśa*), cessation resulting from discrimination (*pratisaṃkhyā-nirodha*), and cessation not resulting from discrimination (*apratisaṃkhyā-nirodha*), etc., included? They may be included in all three [natures]. Mind, etc., transforms to resemble the image of space, etc., and because it is born from mind it is categorized as the [nature that is] dependent on others. Fools falsely grasp it as really existing, and this is categorized as the imagined nature. If meanings such as space, etc., are established as being metaphors for true suchness, they are categorized as the perfected nature. Impure mind, etc., definitely belongs to the dependent on others. Pure mind, etc., may belong to both natures [i.e., dependent on others (*paratantra*) and perfected (*pariṇiṣpanna*)]. Being born of a host of conditions, it belongs to the dependent on others. Being devoid of error, it is categorized as perfected.

How are the three natures and the seven [kinds of] true suchness (*bhūta-tathatā*) related? The seven [kinds of] true suchness are:

1. True suchness of transmigration, that is, the real nature of conditioned dharmas in transmigration.
2. True suchness of the reality of things, that is, the real nature as revealed by the twofold no self (*anātman*).
3. True suchness of consciousness only, that is, the real nature of defiled and pure dharmas that are consciousness only.
4. True suchness of establishment, that is, the real nature of suffering (*duḥkha*).
5. True suchness of wrong conduct, that is, the real nature of origination (*samudaya*).
6. True suchness of purity, that is, the real nature of cessation (*nirodha*).
7. True suchness of proper conduct, that is, the real nature of the path (*mārga*).

These seven real natures are categorized as the perfected [nature] because they are objects of fundamental and subsequently acquired two knowledges. In accordance with their characteristics, [the real natures of] transmigration, suffering, and origination are categorized as the first two natures [imagined and dependent on others], due to false grasping and defilement. The remaining four are categorized as the perfected nature.

How are the three natures related to the six dharmas? All six dharmas are contained in the three natures, because form, feeling, conceptualization, karmic forces, consciousness, and the unconditioned [dharmas] are falsely grasped, are born from conditions, and are [by nature] the truth.

47a How are the three natures related to the five things? The holy teachings are not agreed in the matter of relationship. That is, on the one hand, some sources say that the dependent on others includes images, names, discrimination, and correct knowledge; the perfected nature includes true suchness, and the imagined nature does not include these five things. This means that the name of “image” is given to the dharmas of impure mind and mental activities that transform to resemble the “expressed.” In appearing

resembling the “expresser,” they are given the name of “name.” Mind, etc., which changes, is established as “discrimination.” Because pure mind, etc., is divorced from idle discourse (*prapañca*), it is given the name of “correct knowledge.” They are not said to be other than the expresser and the expressed. These four are born from conditions and are categorized as the dependent on others [nature].

On the other hand, some sources say that the dependent on others includes images and discrimination; the imagined only includes name, and correct knowledge and suchness are categorized as the perfected. This means that the name “image” is given to the seen part of impure mind and mental activities, and the remaining [four] are named “discrimination.” The imagined [nature] is totally devoid of substance, and in order to indicate that it is nonexistent it is given the metaphorical name of “name.” The [last] two are devoid of error and are therefore categorized as the perfected.

On the other hand, there are sources that say that the nature that is dependent on others includes only discrimination, the imagined includes images and name, and correct knowledge and suchness are categorized as the perfected. This means that the seen and seeing parts, etc., of impure mind and mental activities are called “discrimination” in general, because false imagination is their nature. The imagined expresser and expressed are conventionally established as the two things, name and images [respectively.]

Furthermore, some sources say that name belongs to the dependent on others, and its significance belongs to the imagined. This means that the seen and seeing parts, etc., of impure mind and mental activities create the imagined through the power of name and for that reason are called “name.” The imagined is perversely judged according to name. Its substance is really nonexistent, and it is metaphorically named “significance.” Despite the differences of explanation of the five things in the holy teachings, there is no contradiction in their meaning. However, the first explanation is not confused and should be understood in accordance with the extended explanation of the *Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra*.

Also, it is said in the holy teachings that there are five characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*). What is the relationship of these to the three natures? That which is expressed (*abhidheya*) and that which expresses (*abhidhāna*) each contain the three natures. That is, false judgement belongs to the category of the first [imagined] nature. Image, name, and discrimination are either the expressed or the expresser, as the case may be, and belong with the dependent on others. Suchness and correct knowledge are the expressed and the expresser, as the case may be, and belong to the perfected [nature], because subsequently acquired [knowledge] transforms to resemble the characteristic of the expresser.

The characteristic consisting of the connection between the two (*abhidheya-abhidhāna-sambandha*) is categorized as belonging only to the first nature, because significance and name are falsely grasped as really connected.

The characteristic consisting of adherence to that (*tadabhiniveśa*) is solely the dependent on others, because its nature is unreal imagination.

The characteristic consisting of nonadherence (*anabhiniveśa*) is solely the perfected, because its nature is that of pure knowledge, etc.

47b Also, it is said in the holy teachings that there are four realities (*tattva*). What is their relationship to the three natures? Worldly reality and that achieved by reason are categorized as the dependent on others, because they are included in the first three things [i.e., images, name, and discrimination].

Reality related to the purification of the two obstacles [i.e., the obstacle of the passions and the obstacle to that which is to be known] is categorized as the perfected, because it is included in the [last] two things [i.e., correct knowing and suchness].

According to the *Madhyāntavibhāga*, the first reality is categorized as solely the first [imagined] nature, because it is grasped in common [with selves, etc.]. The second reality belongs to [all] three natures, because truth is common to attachment, nondetachment, defilement, and purity. The last two realities are related only to the third [perfected] nature.

What is the relationship between the three natures and the four [noble] truths? Each of the four wholly contains the three natures.

2. Suffering

Also, each of the four [marks] consisting of impermanence (*anitya*), etc., within the truth of suffering contains the three natures. The impermanences are (1) impermanence as absence of nature [this is the imagined nature], because its nature is eternally nonexistent; (2) impermanence as origination and cessation [this is the nature that is dependent on others], because it contains birth and cessation; (3) impermanence as impurity and purity [this is the perfected nature], because its state is transformed.

Suffering is threefold: (1) [the imagined nature is] suffering of that which is grasped, because it is grasped by the support [i.e., mind] of the two graspings, self and dharmas; (2) [the dependent on others is] suffering as the characteristic of events, because its characteristic is the threefold suffering; (3) [the perfected is] suffering of union, because it is united with suffering.

The three kinds of emptiness (*sūnyatā*) are (1) emptiness as absence of nature [this is the imagined nature], because its nature is nonexistent; (2) emptiness as different nature [this is the dependent on others], because it differs from its falsely grasped nature; (3) inherent emptiness [this is the perfected nature], because its nature is revealed by the twofold emptiness.

The three kinds of no self are (1) no self as absence of characteristics [this is the imagined nature], because the characteristics of a self do not exist; (2) no self as the characteristic of difference [this is the nature that is dependent on others], because it differs from the falsely grasped characteristics of a self; (3) no self of its own characteristic [this is the perfected nature], because its own characteristic is revealed by no self.

3. Origination

The three kinds of truth of origination (*samudaya-satya*) are (1) origination as habit energy, that is, the imagined nature grasps

the habit energy, and its name [of imagined nature] is metaphorically established from the grasping of that habit energy; (2) origination as uniform generation, that is, action and passions [and thus it is the nature that is dependent on others]; (3) origination as nonseparation, that is, suchness not yet separated from bondage [and for that reason it is the perfected nature].

4. Cessation

The three kinds of truth of cessation (*nirodha-satya*) are (1) cessation as self-nature, because its self-nature is not born [and therefore it is the imagined nature]; (2) cessation of the two graspings, that is, cessation as a result of discrimination (*pratisaṃkhyā-nirodha*), because the two graspings are not born [and therefore it is the dependent nature]; (3) inherent cessation, that is, because it is true suchness [and is therefore the perfected nature].

5. Path

The three kinds of truth of the path (*mārga-satya*) are (1) path as recognition, because it is able to know the imagined [and is therefore the imagined nature]; (2) path as eternal elimination, because [as the dependent nature] it is able to eliminate the nature that is dependent on others; (3) path as bringing about realization [is the perfected nature] because it can realize the perfected.

However, path as recognition is also common to the last two [natures; i.e., the dependent on others and the perfected]. Seven triads and three natures have been explained by matching them in sequence. This correspondence with the three natures may be metaphorical or real and should be understood according to reason.

How are the three natures related to the objective realms that are activated by the three doors to liberation (*vimokṣa-mukha*)? In principle, all [doors of liberation] are common to [the three natures], but in accordance with specific characteristics [the three natures] are emptiness (*śūnyatā*), desirelessness (*apraṇihita*), and signlessness (*animitta*). Also, based on these, the three [kinds of]

patience regarding the nonbirth [of dharmas] (*anutpattika-dharma-kṣānti*) are born: (1) patience with regard to inherent nonbirth [which is related to the imagined nature]; (2) patience with regard to nonbirth by itself [which is related to the dependent on others]; (3) patience with regard to nonbirth of passions and suffering [which is related to the perfected nature]. These three are the objects of those [patiences] in this order.

How do these three natures include the two truths? You should know that the relative (*saṃvṛti-satya*) contains the three kinds [of natures], but the ultimate truth is solely the perfected nature. The relative is threefold: fictionally relative, operationally relative, and revelationally relative, which, you should know, are the three natures respectively. The ultimate truth is also threefold: 47c (1) ultimate truth of truth, that is, true suchness, because it is the ultimate's truth; (2) ultimate truth of acquisition, that is, *nirvāṇa*, because the ultimate is the same as the truth; (3) ultimate truth of performance, that is, the holy path, because it has the ultimate for its truth. Therefore all are included in the perfected nature, because they are unchanging or devoid of error, as the case may be.

To what knowledges are the three natures related? The imagined is totally unrelated to knowledge, because, being devoid of a substance of its own, it is not a condition as object. Fools grasp it as existing, but the wise know it as nonexistent, so it can be said that it is the object of knowledge for both foolish and wise. The nature that is dependent on others is related to the two [kinds of knowledge], and the perfected nature is only the object of the knowledge of the wise.

Of the three natures, which are metaphorical and which are real? Because the imagined is falsely posited, it can be said to be metaphorical [as a nature]. Being devoid of characteristics of a substance, it is neither metaphorical nor real. The nature that is dependent on others exists really and metaphorically. It can be said to be metaphorically real because its nature consists of combinations [of real dharma], continuities [of dharmas], and [different] states. Mind, mental activities, and form are born from conditions

and may therefore be said to exist really. If there are no real dharmas, metaphorical dharmas do not exist either, because metaphors are established on the basis of real causes. The perfected nature alone really exists, because it is not established in reliance on other conditions.

Are these three different or nondifferent? It must be said that they are neither, because they have no separate substances and because the imagined, that which originates from conditions, and the real truth are different. These three natures are unlimited in their variety of interpretations. Fearing prolixity, we have indicated the essentials.

6. The Threefold Naturelessness

If there are three natures, why did the World-Honored One teach that all dharmas are wholly natureless (*niḥsvabhāva*)? The verses [of Vasubandhu] say,

ON THE BASIS OF THESE THREE NATURES
THE THREEFOLD NATURELESSNESS IS ESTABLISHED.
THEREFORE, THE BUDDHA TAUGHT WITH A HIDDEN INTENTION
THAT ALL DHARMAS ARE NATURELESS.
THE FIRST IS NATURELESSNESS OF CHARACTERISTICS;
THE NEXT IS NATURELESSNESS OF SELF-EXISTENCE;
THE LAST IS THE NATURE THAT RESULTS FROM THE PRIVATION
OF THE FORMER
SELF AND DHARMAS THAT ARE GRASPED.
THIS IS THE ULTIMATE TRUTH OF ALL DHARMAS
AND IS ALSO THE SAME AS TRUE SUCHNESS,
BECAUSE IT IS ETERNALLY SO IN ITS NATURE.
IT IS THE TRUE NATURE OF CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY.

48a

The Treatise says that the subsequently discussed three kinds of naturelessness are established on the basis of the previously mentioned three natures, that is, naturelessness of characteristics, birth, and the ultimate truth. Therefore THE BUDDHA TAUGHT WITH

A HIDDEN INTENTION THAT ALL DHARMAS ARE NATURELESS but not that these natures are completely nonexistent.

The words TAUGHT WITH A HIDDEN INTENTION show that it is not the final truth. That is, even though the last two natures [i.e., the dependent on others and the perfected] are not nonexistent, still there are fools who superimpose really existing selves and dharmas with self-natures upon them and falsely grasp them. This is called their "imagined [nature]." In order to eliminate this grasping, the Buddha, the World-Honored One, spoke in general of the naturelessness of both the existing [i.e., last two natures] and the nonexistent [first nature].

How are these three established on the basis of those [three natures]? NATURELESSNESS OF CHARACTERISTICS is established on the basis of the first, imagined [nature], because substance and characteristics are absolutely nonexistent, like flowers in the sky. NATURELESSNESS OF BIRTH is established on the basis of the next, the dependent on others [nature]. These [things originating in this way] are all like illusory things that are born of a host of conditions. They have not, as in falsely grasped, a nature of their own, and therefore it is said in a manner of speaking that they are naturelessness, but their nature is not completely nonexistent. NATURELESSNESS OF ULTIMATE TRUTH is established on the basis of the last, perfected [nature]. It is said in a manner of speaking to be natureless by virtue of the ultimate truth being separated from the first nature of imagined selves and dharmas, but it is not by nature wholly nonexistent, just as great space, although pervading the many forms, is still revealed by the naturelessness of the many forms. Even though the dependent on others is not ultimate truth, it can also be said to be the naturelessness of the ultimate truth, but it is not said to be because it is confused with the second [nature].

This [perfected] nature is THE ULTIMATE TRUTH OF ALL DHARMAS, because it is the truth of the ultimate truth of all dharmas. However, the truth of ultimate truth is, in brief, of four kinds: (1) worldly ultimate truth, i.e., aggregates, sense bases, sense fields, etc.;

(2) ultimate truth of principles, i.e., the four truths of suffering, etc.; (3) ultimate truth of attainment, i.e., the true suchness of the twofold emptiness; (4) ultimate truth of ultimate truth, i.e., the sole real realm of the Dharma.

Of these, [the perfected nature] is the last [of the above four] ultimate truths, because it is the truth that is activated by the ultimate path. In order to exclude the first three [forms of ultimate truth], it adds, THIS IS THE ULTIMATE TRUTH OF ALL DHARMAS AND IS ALSO THE SAME AS TRUE SUCHNESS (*bhūta-tathatā*). TRUE means “genuine,” indicating that it is not false. SUCHNESS means “eternally so,” which expresses its changelessness. This means that it is called TRUE SUCHNESS because this reality is ETERNALLY SO IN ITS NATURE in all states, which is to say, the profound, nonfalse truth.

The word also shows that this [nature] also has many names, such as the “Realm of the Dharma” (*dharmā-dhātu*), the “Limit of Reality” (*bhūta-koṭi*), etc., as is extensively explained in accordance with the meaning in other treatises.

This [perfected] nature is THE TRUE NATURE OF CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY. That is, the nature of consciousness only is, in brief, of two kinds: (1) false, that is, the imagined; and (2) real, that is, the perfected. [The verses] use the words TRUE NATURE in order to exclude the false.

48b

Again, there are two natures: (1) the relative, that is, the dependent on others; and (2) ultimate truth, that is, the perfected. [The verses] therefore speak of TRUE NATURE in order to exclude the relative.

The [last] three verses [i.e., verses 23–25] show that when various scriptures use the words “naturelessness” it is not the final truth, and those who are wise should not depend on them as generally excluding all dharmas as utterly natureless.

Chapter XI

The Holy Path

Such are the characteristics and nature of consciousness only that has been demonstrated. Who awakens to it and enters, how, and by how many states? Those who are endowed with the two dispositions (*gotra*) of the Mahayana enter and awaken to it gradually, in five states. What is the meaning of the two dispositions of the Mahayana? The first is the inherent disposition (*prakṛtistha-gotra*), that is, the causes [i.e., seeds] of pure dharmas existing naturally from beginningless time adhering to root consciousness. The second is the disposition created by perfuming, that is, those that are created by perfuming brought about by hearing, etc., from hearing the Dharma that flows uniformly from the realm of the Dharma. One must possess these two dispositions of the Mahayana in order gradually to awaken to and enter consciousness only.

What is the meaning of the five states of awakening to and entering consciousness only? The first is the state of equipment (*saṃbhāra-avasthā*), that is, cultivation of the aids to liberation (*mokṣa-bhāgiya*) of the Mahayana. The second is the state of added effort (*prayoga-avasthā*), that is, cultivation of the aids to penetration of the Mahayana. The third is the state of thorough understanding (*prativedha-avasthā*), that is, the path of insight dwelled on by all bodhisattvas. The fourth is the state of cultivation (*bhāvanā-avasthā*), that is, the path of cultivation dwelled on by all bodhisattvas. The fifth is the state of culmination (*niṣṭhā-avasthā*), that is, abiding in Supreme, Perfect Awakening (*anuttara-samyak-sambodhi*).

What is gradual awakening to and entering consciousness only? It means that in the state of equipment, the bodhisattva is able

deeply to believe and understand the characteristics and nature of consciousness. In the state of added effort, he is able gradually to subdue the grasped and the grasper (*grāhya-grāhaka*) and promote a true view. In the state of thorough understanding, he thoroughly understands in accordance with reality. In the state of cultivation, he cultivates [what he understands] over and over in accordance with principles he has perceived and subdues remaining obstacles. Arriving at the state of culmination, he emerges from the obstacles perfect and clear. He is able to the end of time to convert varieties of sentient beings and cause them to awaken to and enter the characteristics and nature of consciousness only.

1. Stage of Equipment

What are the characteristics of the first state, that of “equipment”? The verses [of Vasubandhu] say,

AS LONG AS ONE DOES NOT GENERATE CONSCIOUSNESS
THAT SEEKS TO ABIDE IN THE NATURE OF CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY,
ONE IS STILL UNABLE TO DESTROY
THE PROPENSITIES OF THE TWOFOLD GRASPING.

The Treatise says that everything from the arousal of a profound, firm, great thought of awakening up to the not-yet-risen penetrating consciousness and the seeking to abide in the real nature of the ultimate truth of consciousness only is included in the stage of equipment. This is because in order to advance to Supreme Perfect Awakening, one repeatedly cultivates many superior kinds of [spiritual] equipment. For the sake of sentient beings, one energetically seeks liberation, and as a result [this state] is also named “aids to liberation.”

Because in this state the bodhisattva relies on the superior power of the four consisting of cause [i.e., his class], good friends, attention, and equipment [consisting of merit and knowledge], he has a profound faith in and understanding of the truth of consciousness only; but despite this he is still incapable of comprehending the emptiness of the two graspings and resides for the

most part outside, cultivating the practices of bodhisattvas. Therefore as far as the propensities attracted by the twofold grasping are concerned, he is still without the power that would enable him to subdue [the propensities] and prevent them from generating the actual activity of the twofold grasping.

The words “twofold grasping” indicate the grasping of the two graspings because of its nature of grasping the grasped and grasper. Perfuming from the two twofold grasping is named “propensities,” because they pursue (*anu*) sentient beings and slumber (*śaya*) concealed in the store consciousness. Or, they are named “propensities” because they pursue (*anu*) and increase (*śaya*) transgressions. They are the seeds of both the obstacle to that which is to be known and that of the passions.

2. The Two Obstacles

Regarding the obstacle of the passions, at its head is *satkāya-dṛṣṭi* [the view of real personhood] of grasping an imagined real self, [and it is made up of] one hundred twenty-eight fundamental passions and the various secondary passions that are their issue. These torment and vex sentient beings in mind and body and obstruct *nirvāṇa*, and are named the “obstacle of the passions.”

As for the obstacle to that which is to be known, at its head is the *satkāya-dṛṣṭi* of grasping imagined real dharma, [consisting of] views, doubt, ignorance, craving, hatred, pride, etc. They obscure the nonerroneous nature of the object that is to be known and obstruct *bodhi*, and they are known as the “obstacle to that which is to be known.”

The obstacle to that which is to be known definitely does not accompany consciousness as retribution, because [the latter] is quite weak, it is not associated with ignorance and discernment, and the class of knowledge of emptiness of dharma occurs simultaneously with it. Within the seven evolving consciousnesses, there may be few or many [dharma that constitute this obstacle] as the case may be, just as was said of the passions. The five consciousnesses of the eye, etc., are devoid of imagination and therefore definitely are not

associated with views concerning dharmas, doubt, etc. The remainder [craving, etc.,] may all occur through the power of mind (*manas*).

This obstacle is only associated with the two [kinds of] minds consisting of the nongood and nondetermined, because the treatises say that ignorance is only related to the nongood and nondetermined, because delusion and nondelusion, etc., are not associated. This obstacle necessarily exists along with the obstacle of the passions, because this [latter] uses that [former obstacle] as its support. Even though there is no difference in their substances, their functions are distinct. Therefore the two propensities are strong or weak according to which path is used, and [one] is eliminated prior or subsequently [to the other]. This obstacle is “born of retribution” (*vipākaja*) in the [category of] nondefiled and nondetermined, but not of the remaining three kinds, because the strength and functioning of dignity, etc., of those [latter] are slight, and they do not obstruct that which is to be known or *bodhi*. The name “nondefiled” is established from the point of view of the two vehicles, but it is also defiled from the point of view of bodhisattvas.

If the obstacle to that which is to be known is made up of views, ignorance, etc., why do the scriptures say that its seeds are the stages of ignorance? It is referred to as “ignorance” in general because ignorance increases, not because of the absence of views, etc., just as the seeds of the passions are given the names of the four stages of all realms, desire for form, desire for becoming, and desire for craving. How could they also be devoid of pride, ignorance, etc.?

When these two obstacles originate from discrimination, they are categorized as being eliminated by [the path of] insight. When they originate spontaneously, they are categorized as being eliminated by [the path of] cultivation. [Adherents of] the two vehicles can only eliminate the obstacle of the passions; the bodhisattva eliminates both [obstacles]. Only the holy path is capable of eternally eliminating both kinds, but the subduing of the two as they occur in actual activity occurs in the impure path. Even though the bodhisattva abiding in the state of equipment subdues the gross, actual activity of the two [obstacles], still, as far as the subtle [actual

activities] and propensities of the two obstacles are concerned, the power of [meditative] tranquility and insight (*śamatha-vipaśyanā*) is slight and still incapable of destroying them.

In this state [of equipment], one has not yet realized the true suchness of consciousness only. Through the power of resolve, one cultivates superior practices of various kinds, and, you should know, this is also included in the stage of resolve and application (*adhimukti-caryā-bhūmi*).

What are the characteristics of the superior practices cultivated [by the bodhisattva]? In brief, they are of two kinds, that is, merit and knowledge. Those that are discernment by nature among the superior practices are all named “knowledge,” while the remainder are named “merit.” Also, the six perfections (*pāramitā*) in their common characteristics are both [merit and knowledge]. In their specific characteristics, the first five are merit and the sixth is discernment. Or the first three are categorized as merit only, the last is only knowledge, and the remainder are both.

Again, there are two kinds [of practices], that is, benefitting oneself and benefitting others. Through the power of mental disposition, all superior practices that one has cultivated are practices that benefit oneself and others. Speaking in terms of their distinct characteristics, the six perfections and the [thirty-seven] aids to *bodhi*, etc., are practices for self-benefit, while the four means of conversion (*saṃgraha-vastu*), the four immeasurables (*apramāṇa*), etc., are all categorized as practices that benefit others. There is no end of the diversity of these practices. All are the superior practices cultivated in this state [of equipment].

Even though in this state the two obstacles are not yet subdued and removed, and there are three regressions during the period one cultivates the superior practices, still [the bodhisattva] can fortify his mind in respect of these three things, and be bold, and not regress in what he has realized and cultivated. [The three possible regressions are] (1) that his mind falters upon hearing that supreme, perfect *bodhi* is vast, great, profound, and distant, but recalling that others have realized great *bodhi* he fortifies his

mind, is bold, and does not regress; (2) that his mind falters upon hearing that the perfection of giving (*dāna-pāramitā*), etc., is extremely difficult to cultivate, but aware that he is already mentally disposed and is capable of cultivating giving, etc., he fortifies his mind, is bold, and does not regress; (3) that his mind falters upon hearing that the perfect transmutation of the support of Buddha is extremely difficult to realize, but recalling the coarse quality of the good of others and his own marvellous causes [for *bodhi*], he fortifies his mind, is bold, and does not regress. As a result of these three things, he fortifies his mind and with unshakable ardor he cultivates the various superior practices.

3. State of Added Effort

Next, what are the characteristics of the state of added effort? The verses [of Vasubandhu] say,

SETTING THE LEAST THING BEFORE ONE
AND SAYING, IT IS OF THE NATURE OF CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY,
ONE DOES NOT REALLY ABIDE IN CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY,
BECAUSE THERE IS SOMETHING OBTAINED.

The Treatise says that the bodhisattva starting out during the first incalculable eon provides himself well with the equipment of merits and knowledge, and the aids to liberation have been completed. In order to enter the path of insight and abide in the quality [that all things have] of being consciousness only, he then cultivates the added efforts and subdues the two graspings; that is, [he cultivates] heat (*uṣmagata*), summits (*mūrdhana*), patience (*kṣānti*), and supreme worldly dharmas (*laukikāgra-dharma*).

These four are given the comprehensive name of “aids to penetration” (*nirvedha-bhāgiya*), because they are aids conducive to penetration. They are given the name of “added effort” because they are near the path of insight. It does not mean that the former [state of] equipment is not added effort.

49b

The four dharmas of heat, etc., are established on the basis of being prior and subsequent states consisting of the four investigations

(*paryeṣaṇā*) and four ascertainments in accordance with reality (*yathā-bhūta parijñā*). The “four investigations” refer to investigating names (*nāma*), meaning (*vastu*), nature (*svabhāva*), and differences (*viśeṣa*) as existing in a manner of speaking but nonexistent in reality. To know totally in accordance with reality that these four do not exist apart from consciousness, and that consciousness does not exist either, is called “ascertainment in accordance with reality” (*yathā-bhūta-parijñā*). Names and meanings are distinct and are therefore investigated separately. Both are the same in two characteristics [which are nature and distinct characteristics] and are therefore reflected upon in unison.

On the basis of the *samādhi* “obtaining light” one commences the inferior investigation and contemplates the nonexistence of the grasped. This establishes the state of “heat.” That is, in this state, one contemplates for the first time the four dharmas of names, etc., that are grasped as transformations of one’s mind, and while accepting them as existing in a manner of speaking, [one realizes that] in reality they cannot be obtained. The name “obtaining light” is established because it is the grasping of the mark of the antecedent to the “sun of discernment” of this acquired path. It is also named “heat” because it is the mark of the antecedent of the “fire” of this acquired path.

On the basis of the *samādhi* “increase in light” one commences the superior investigation and contemplates [anew] the nonexistence of the grasped. This establishes the state of “summits” (*mūrdhana*). That is, in this state one again contemplates the grasped four dharmas of names, etc., as transformations of one’s own mind, accepting them as existing in a manner of speaking, though in reality they cannot be obtained. It is named “increase of light” because the characteristic of light grows. It is the ultimate state of investigation and therefore is also named “summits.”

On the basis of the *samādhi* “confirming and conforming” one commences the inferior knowledge in accordance with reality. One firmly confirms the nonexistence of the grasped and conforms to and is patient with the nonexistence of the grasper. There being

no real object apart from grasping consciousness, how can there be a real consciousness apart from the object that is grasped, because grasper and grasped are established through mutual dependence. This period of confirming and conforming is given the general name of “patience” (*kṣānti*). The name “confirming and conforming” is due to the confirmation of the former [emptiness of the grasped] and conformity [or patience regarding] the latter [emptiness of the grasped] and conformity [or patience regarding] the latter [emptiness of the grasper]. It is also called “patience” because one is patient with regard to the emptiness of objects and consciousness.

On the basis of the *samādhi* “noninterruption” one commences the superior knowledge in conformity to reality and confirms the emptiness of the two graspings. This establishes “supreme worldly dharmas” (*laukikāgra-dharma*). That is, the previous superior patience only confirms the emptiness of the grasper, but in the present supreme worldly dharmas, both kinds of emptiness are confirmed. Because one necessarily enters the path of insight immediately following this [*samādhi*], it is named “noninterruption.” Of dharmas of ordinary beings, these are the most exalted, and for that reason they are named “supreme worldly dharmas.”

With these heat and summits, one contemplates the emptiness of the grasped by means of the grasping consciousness. When the inferior patience arises, one confirms the characteristic of emptiness of the object. In the middle state of the middle patience, conformity to and patience toward the emptiness of the grasping consciousness as well as the object is possible. In the state when superior patience arises, one confirms the emptiness of the grasper, and, with supreme worldly dharmas, one doubly confirms emptiness of both [the grasped and the grasper].

Because all [these investigations] are bound to characteristics, one is still unable to realize reality. Therefore it is said that in these four states, the bodhisattva still SETS UP THE LEAST THING BEFORE HIM, SAYING, IT IS OF THE NATURE OF CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY, the nature of ultimate truth. Because the two characteristics of emptiness and existence are still not abandoned, and one remains bound

to these characteristics, and, for the contemplating mind, THERE IS SOMETHING GRASPED, HE DOES NOT REALLY ABIDE IN the true principle of CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY. He truly abides in it once these characteristics are abandoned. Based on these interpretations, some verses say,

THE BODHISATTVA IN THE STATE OF *SAMĀDHI*
 CONTEMPLATES IMAGES AS BEING MIND ONLY.
 THE CHARACTERISTIC OF TRUTH HAVING BEEN ELIMINATED,
 HE EXAMINES THEM AS ONLY HIS OWN THOUGHTS.
 ABIDING IN THIS WAY WITHIN MIND,
 HE REALIZES THAT THE GRASPED DOES NOT EXIST;
 THEN, THAT THE GRASPER IS ALSO NONEXISTENT;
 FINALLY, HE CONTACTS [THAT STATE IN WHICH] NOTHING
 IS OBTAINED.

49c

In this state of added effort, one still has not discarded the bonds of images, nor is one able to eliminate the bonds of the gross [propensities]. One is only able to subdue [but not eliminate] the two graspings of discrimination, because they oppose the path of insight [which follows]. One does not yet wholly get rid of the innate [forms of grasping], nor is one able to destroy the two propensities, because one's impure contemplating mind still obtains something and there is discrimination; therefore one does not wholly subdue [the innate grasping] or completely destroy [their seeds].

In this state, the bodhisattva studies and contemplates the established truths [i.e., the four noble truths] and the nonestablished truth [i.e., true suchness] in order to attract the future two kinds of insight and in order to subdue the two forms of the obstacle of discrimination. The nonestablished truth is principally contemplated, unlike with the [followers of the] two vehicles, who only contemplate the established [truths].

Even though during the period of skill in means, the bodhisattva who produces the good roots of heat, etc., passes through various trance states (*dhyāna*), he is still only able to perfect them in the fourth [trance state], because it is the most excellent support for entering the path of insight. Only [bodhisattvas] in the

realm of desire and of good destinies generate [these good roots], because for others, discerning and disgusted minds are insufficient. This state is also categorized as the stage of resolve and application because one does not yet realize the ultimate truth of consciousness only.

4. Path of Insight: State of Thorough Understanding

Next, what are the characteristics of the state of thorough understanding? The verses [of Vasubandhu] say,

WHENEVER, REGARDING THE OBJECTIVE REALM,
KNOWLEDGE IS DEVOID OF SOMETHING OBTAINED,
THEN IT DWELLS IN CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY
BECAUSE IT IS DIVORCED FROM THE CHARACTERISTICS OF
TWOFOLD GRASPING.

The Treatise says that when the bodhisattva, REGARDING THE OBJECTIVE REALM, is devoid of discriminating knowledge and DEVOID OF SOMETHING OBTAINED, because he does not grasp the manifold images of idle discourse, he is said truly to DWELL IN the nature of the ultimate truth of CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY, which is to say, the knowledge that realizes true suchness is equal to true suchness, because both are divorced from the characteristics of grasped and grasper. The characteristics of grasper and grasped are imagination, because mind that obtains something [as an object] manifests itself as idle discourse.

There is an interpretation [by Sthiramati] that this knowledge is devoid of both parts [i.e., grasper and grasped], because it is said that it is devoid of the characteristics of the grasped and grasper.

According to another interpretation [by Nanda], both the seen and seeing parts exist in this knowledge, because [the seeing part] arises bound to the seen [part] and is named “having an object.” If you name it “having that as an object” in the absence of an image, one must also name knowledge of form, etc., “knowledge of sound,” etc. If it is devoid of the seeing part, it must be unable to perceive objects, so how could it be said that it is knowledge that has true

suchness as an object? It must not be that the nature of true suchness is to be named “having an object.” Therefore it must be conceded that this [nondiscriminating knowledge] possesses the seeing part of consciousness.

There is an interpretation [by Dharmapāla, which is the correct one,] that the seeing part of this knowledge exists but the seen part does not, because it is said that while devoid of images, it grasps and does not grasp. Despite having a seen part, it is still devoid of discrimination. It is said that it is not a grasper but not that grasping is totally nonexistent. Despite being devoid of a seen part, still it can be said that this [knowledge] arises bound to the image of suchness, because it is not separate from suchness. Just as the self-authenticating part (*svasaṃvitti-bhāga*) does not change into an object when it has the seeing part as an object, so must it be in this case. If it were to change into an object, then it would not immediately realize [suchness as an object] and would be like subsequently acquired knowledge and contain discrimination. Therefore it must be admitted that this [knowledge] has a seeing part but no seen [part]. 50a

When this knowledge is born with interruption following added efforts, its substance embodies true suchness and is named “state of thorough understanding.” It is also named “path of insight” because it is the preliminary intuition of truth.

However, the path of insight is, briefly, of two kinds. The first is the path of insight of reality (*tattva-darśana-mārga*). That is, it is the same as the so-called nondiscriminating knowledge (*nirvikalpaka-jñāna*). It really realizes the reality disclosed by the twofold emptiness and really eliminates the propensities of discrimination of the two obstacles. Even though it culminates after many moments, still [the moments] are uniform in characteristics, and therefore it is said to be generally of a single moment (*kṣaṇa*).

There is an opinion that of these [accomplishments], the twofold emptiness and two kinds of obstacles, are gradually realized and gradually eliminated [respectively], because of differences of shallow and deep and gross and subtle. There is [another] opinion,

[which is correct,] that of these, the twofold emptiness and the two kinds of obstacles are suddenly realized and eliminated, because of the extreme ability resulting from the power of [previous] mental disposition.

The second [kind of path of insight] is the path of insight of characteristics (*lakṣaṇa-darśana-mārga*) [which involves subsequently acquired knowledge that has as its object the characteristics of true suchness]. It is also of two kinds. The first is the contemplation of nonestablished truth (*avyavasthita-satya*), which contains three kinds of moments: (1) internal knowledge that expels the false object consisting of “dharma,” which is able to remove the weak class of propensities of discrimination; (2) internal knowledge that expels the false object consisting of “sentient beings,” which is able to remove the medium class of propensities of discrimination; (3) comprehensive knowledge that expels the false objects of all “sentient beings” and “dharma,” which is able to remove all propensities of discrimination. The former two are named “knowledge of dharma” (*dharma-jñāna*), because each has a specific object. The third is named “knowledge of species” (*anvaya-jñāna*), because it unites objects in a comprehensive manner [as species]. [This path] is established in imitation of the seeing part of the twofold emptiness of the path of insight of reality, specifically insofar as the elimination of obstacles is concerned, and comprehensively in the uninterrupted (*ānantarya*) [stage] and [stage of] liberation (*vimukti*). This is named the “path of insight of characteristics.”

There is an interpretation that these [above three moments] are the path of insight of reality, because the path of insight of characteristics has the four truths as an object. There is another interpretation, [which is correct,] that these three are the path of insight of characteristics, because the path of insight of reality does not distinguish objects.

The second [kind of path of insight of characteristics] has as an object the established truth [i.e., the four noble truths] and is made up of sixteen moments. It also is twofold. In the first, dharma

and species are established separately in sixteen moments on the basis of contemplating the grasped and grasper.

That is, there are four moments regarding the truth of suffering: (1) patience regarding knowledge of dharma vis-à-vis suffering (*duḥkhe-dharma-jñāna-kṣānti*), that is, contemplation of the suchness of the truth of suffering in the three realms. It directly eliminates twenty-eight kinds of propensities of discrimination that are eliminated by perceiving suffering in the three realms; (2) knowledge regarding dharmas vis-à-vis suffering (*duḥkhe-dharma-jñāna*), that is, contemplation of the previous suchness immediately following patience and realization of liberation from the previously eliminated passions; (3) patience regarding knowledge of species vis-à-vis suffering (*duḥkhe-anvaya-jñāna-kṣānti*), that is, pure discernment is born immediately following knowledge, and patience and knowledge vis-à-vis dharmas are each realized within separately. It is said that succeeding holy dharmas are all of this species; (4) knowledge of species vis-à-vis suffering (*duḥkhe-anvaya-jñāna*), that is, pure knowledge is born immediately after this [patience], which considers and confirms patience with regard to knowledge of species vis-à-vis suffering.

Just as there are four moments with regard to the truth of suffering, so must there be concerning the truths of origination, cessation, and path. Of these sixteen moments, eight are contemplations of suchness and eight are contemplations of correct knowledge. These are established separately in imitation of the seeing part and the self-authenticating part of the uninterrupted [stage] and [stage of] liberation of the path of insight of reality. They are named the “path of insight of characteristics.”

50b

The second [form of contemplation of the established truth] is of sixteen moments in which dharmas and species are separately established through the contemplation of the truth in the lower [realm] and the upper [two realms]. This means that one contemplates the manifested realm [of desire] and the unmanifested realm [i.e., realms of form and no form] insofar as suffering, etc., are concerned, each in two moments, patience in comprehension (*abhisamaya*), and knowledge of comprehension. One contemplates the

[four] truths in imitation of the seeing part of the uninterrupted [stage] and [the stage of] liberation of the path of insight, as the case may be. It eliminates the one hundred twelve propensities of discrimination that are eliminated by insight. It is named the “path of insight of characteristics.”

In accordance with the broad dissemination of the truth of the holy teachings, it is said that the path of insight of characteristics contains nine kinds of moments. These are separately established on the basis of the former two [forms of] established truth as object with their [meditative] tranquility and insight of sixteen varieties [of moments]. That is, patience and knowledge belonging to the class of dharmas and species are combined, and it is said that each contains four contemplations, making eight moments. Tranquility associated with these eight can be said generally to make one [moment]. Even though in the path of insight, tranquility and contemplation function together, still as far as the meaning of “insight” is concerned, contemplation conforms to it, not tranquility. Therefore they are not the same, inasmuch as contemplation is analytical and tranquility is synthetical. Consequently, these nine moments are called the “path of insight of characteristics.”

It is said, in a manner of speaking, that the path of insight of characteristics arises on the basis of [the path of insight of] reality immediately after [the occurrence of] supreme worldly dharmas, and that it eliminates the propensities. This is not really so, because it cannot arise until after the path of insight of reality, because the established [truth] occurs subsequent to the nonestablished [truth], and because the propensities of discrimination are already eliminated by the [path of insight of] reality.

The prior path of insight of reality realizes the nature of consciousness only, while the following path of insight of characteristics realizes the characteristics of consciousness only. Of these two, the first is superior, and therefore the verse concerns itself solely with that. The former path of insight of reality is categorized as root knowledge, while the following path of insight of characteristics is categorized as subsequently acquired knowledge.

Do the various [moments of] subsequently acquired knowledge have the two parts [of seeing and seen]? According to one interpretation, neither exist, because it is divorced from the two graspings. According to another interpretation, this knowledge has the seeing [part] but not the seen, because it is said that this class of knowledge contains discrimination, and because holy knowledge is wholly capable of immediately discerning its object. It is said to be divorced from the two graspings because it is unattached.

According to another [correct] interpretation [by Dharmapāla], both parts exist in this knowledge, because it is said that this [knowledge] reflects upon the apparent characteristics of suchness and does not perceive the real nature of true suchness. It is also said that this knowledge discriminates distinct and common characteristics of dharmas, etc., and it contemplates differences in capacity and nature among sentient beings and preaches to them. Also, it is said that this knowledge manifests bodies and [Buddha] lands, etc., for sentient beings and preaches the True Dharma. If it did not transform and appear as form, sound, etc., how could there be such events as manifesting bodies and preaching the Dharma, etc.? If form does not appear when the support of the aggregate of form is transmuted, there must not be any feeling, etc., when supports of the [other] four aggregates are transmuted. Also, if this knowledge does not transform to resemble an objective realm, dharmas apart from its own substance must not be objects, and when it has form, etc., as an object, it must have sounds, etc., as objects. Also, when it has as objects things that are not dharmas, etc., it must be devoid of a condition as object, because these substances are unreal and devoid of the function of being conditions. Consequently, both parts exist in this subsequent knowledge.

How are these two paths of insight connected with the six comprehensions (*abhisamaya*)? The six comprehensions are as follows:

50c

- (1) Comprehension as thought, that is, the highest category of discernment attained through thought associated with the feeling of joy. It is able to contemplate the common characteristics of dharmas, produce heat (*uṣmagata*), etc., and, in

contemplating dharmas in the path of added effort, its functioning is most intense; therefore it is established as being a comprehension in a manner of speaking. Heat, etc., are not capable of extensively discriminating dharmas, nor have they yet realized the truth, and therefore they are not comprehensions.

(2) Comprehension of faith, that is, certain, pure faith of both mundane and supramundane kinds, that has the Three Treasures as objects. It is given the name “comprehension” because it assists comprehension and prevents its regression.

(3) Comprehension of moral precepts (*śīla*), that is, pure moral precepts expel the impurity of immorality and cause comprehension to increase in brightness, and it is also named “comprehension.”

(4) Comprehension of truths in the knowledge of comprehension (*abhisamaya-jñāna-satya-abhisamaya*), that is, [comprehension] of all kinds of truth of root knowledge or subsequently acquired knowledge having as an object the nonestablished [truths; i.e., the four noble truths].

(5) Comprehension of truths in the knowledge that borders on comprehension (*abhisamayāntika-jñāna-satya-abhisamaya*), that is, the various knowledges, mundane and supramundane, subsequent to the comprehension of truths in the knowledge of comprehension, that have the established [truths] as objects.

(6) Ultimate comprehension, that is, knowledge in the ultimate stage, [consisting of] knowledge of termination, etc.

The path of insight of reality includes a part of the fourth comprehension, and the path of insight of characteristics includes parts of the fourth and fifth. Even though the second and third [comprehensions] occur simultaneously with this [path], still they are not of the nature [of the path], so they are not included.

When the bodhisattva acquires these two paths of insight, he is born in the family of Tathāgatas. He dwells on the stage of Extreme Joy, easily grasps the realm of the Dharma, and acquires

various forms of sameness [with regard to beings]. He is born eternally in the great assemblies [of bodhisattvas] of the Buddhas and acquires mastery in many hundreds of areas. He knows himself that he will realize great *bodhi* before long and be able to benefit and gladden all forever.

5. State and Path of Cultivation

Next, the state of cultivation (*bhāvanā-avasthā*). What are its characteristics? The Verses [of Vasubandhu] say,

DEVOID OF ANYTHING OBTAINED, INCONCEIVABLE,
THIS IS SUPRAMUNDANE KNOWLEDGE.
BECAUSE OF ABANDONING THE TWOFOLD COARSENESS.
ONE REALIZES THE TRANSMUTATION OF THE SUPPORT.

The Treatise says that the bodhisattva, having risen from the former path of insight, again repeatedly cultivates the nondiscriminating knowledge in order to remove the remaining obstacles and realize the transmutation of the support. Because this knowledge is far removed from grasped and grasper, it is said to be DEVOID OF ANYTHING OBTAINED, INCONCEIVABLE. Alternately, it is said to be DEVOID OF ANYTHING OBTAINED because it is divorced from idle discourse. It is said to be INCONCEIVABLE because its marvellous functioning is difficult to fathom.

It is SUPRAMUNDANE, nondiscriminating KNOWLEDGE. It is named SUPRAMUNDANE because it transcends the world. The propensities of the twofold grasping are the roots of the world. Only this [knowledge] can eliminate them, so that it alone deserves the name SUPRAMUNDANE. Alternately, the name SUPRAMUNDANE is established on the basis of two meanings, that is, it is pure in substance and realizes true suchness. Such knowledge is alone said to be SUPRAMUNDANE because it contains these two kinds of meaning, which is not the case with other [kinds of knowledge]. This is the nondiscriminating knowledge in the ten stages (*bhūmi*).

Because one cultivates it repeatedly, one ABANDONS THE TWOFOLD COARSENESS. The seeds of the two obstacles receive the name of COARSENESS because they are incapacities that oppose the light

51a

and fine. [This knowledge] causes their eternal extinction, and for that reason it is said to ABANDON them. Because it is capable of ABANDONING THE TWOFOLD COARSENESS, one is able to REALIZE the great TRANSMUTATION OF THE SUPPORT.

SUPPORT means “that which is depended upon,” which is to say that it supports the arising of another, because it is the support of defiled and pure dharmas. “Defiled” means false imagination. “Pure” means the true perfected nature. Transmutation is twofold: transmutation as abandonment and transmutation as acquisition. As a result of repeatedly cultivating nondiscriminating knowledge and eliminating the coarseness of the two obstacles in root consciousness, one is able to transmute and abandon the imagined [nature] from the dependent [nature], and one is able to transmute and acquire the perfected nature within the dependent [nature]. By transmuting the passions, one acquires great *nirvāṇa*; by transmuting the obstacle to that which is to be known, one realizes supreme awakening. The concept of consciousness only is established in order that sentient beings may realize and acquire the two results of the transmutation of the support.

Alternately, the support is the true suchness of consciousness only, because it is the support of *saṃsāra* and *nirvāṇa*. The foolish are mistaken and deluded concerning this true suchness; therefore from beginningless time they have experienced the suffering of *saṃsāra*. The wise are apart from error and awaken to this true suchness and acquire the ultimate peace and happiness of *nirvāṇa*. As a result of repeatedly cultivating nondiscriminating knowledge and eliminating the coarseness of the two obstacles in root consciousness, one is therefore able to transmute and destroy *saṃsāra*, which is supported by suchness, and transmute and realize *nirvāṇa*, which is supported by suchness. This is true suchness apart from the nature of defilement. Even though suchness is pure by nature, its characteristics are defiled. Then, when it is separated from defilement, it is said in a manner of speaking that it is newly purified, which is to say, this new purity is said to be the transmuted support.

In the state of cultivation, one eliminates the obstacles and realizes [true suchness]. Even though *bodhi* is acquired in this state, still this is not the meaning indicated by this [above] verse. The intention of the verse is merely to indicate the transmutation of consciousness only. The completed state of [followers of] the two vehicles is referred to as the “body of liberation” (*vimukti-kāya*), because one in the state of Great Sage (*mahā-muni*) is referred to as “Dharma body” (*dharma-kāya*).

How does one realize and acquire the twofold transmutation of the support? One realizes and acquires the twofold transmutation of the support by cultivating ten superior practices during ten stages (*bhūmi*), by eliminating ten serious obstacles, and by realizing ten kinds of true suchness.

6. The Ten Stages

The ten stages are as follows:

- (1) The stage of “extreme joy” (*pramuditā*), because one first acquires the nature of a saint (*ārya*), realizes the twofold emptiness, and is able to benefit oneself and others.
- (2) The stage of “immaculateness” (*vimalā*), because one is endowed with pure morality and has removed oneself far from the defilement of passions that have the ability to generate minor faults.
- (3) The stage of “light emissions” (*prabhā-karī*), because one perfects the great Dharma *dhāraṇī* of superior *samādhi* and is able to emit the boundless light of marvellous discernment.
- (4) The stage of “blazing discernment” (*arciṣmatī*), because one dwells in the most excellent dharmas of the aids to *bodhi* (*bodhi-pakṣa*), because one burns the fuel that is the passions, and because the fire of discernment grows.
- (5) The stage that is “difficult to vanquish” (*sudurjayā*), because the modes of activity of the two kinds of knowledge, true and relative, are opposed, and uniting them and

bringing about their association is extremely difficult to do in this stage.

(6) The stage of “presence” (*abhimukhī*), because one dwells in the knowledge of conditioned arising and this attracts nondiscriminating, supreme discernment and causes it to be present.

51b (7) The stage that is “far going” (*dūramgamā*), because it reaches the abode of the imageless, it is the end of effort, and it exceeds the paths of the world and the two vehicles.

(8) The stage that is “unshakable” (*acalā*), because nondiscriminating knowledge continues without intervention, and images, passions, and effort cannot move it.

(9) The stage of “good discernment” (*sādhumati*), because one has perfected the four unobstructed analytical knowledges (*pratisaṃvid*) and is able to preach the Dharma well, everywhere in the universe.

(10) The stage of the “cloud of the Dharma” (*dharma-meghā*), because the cloud of the Dharma of great knowledge, filled with the water of a host of virtues, covers all like space [and covers] the grossness and fills the Dharma body.

In this way, the ten stages comprehensively include as their nature conditioned and unconditioned merits. They are called “stages” [lit. “earths”] because they are superior supports for the practices that are to be cultivated and [because they] cause them to appear and grow [as the earth does].

The “ten superior practices” are the ten perfections. Giving (*dāna*) is of three kinds: material gifts, the giving of fearlessness, and the giving of the Dharma. Moral precepts are of three kinds: moral precepts as personal conduct, moral precepts as embracing wholesome dharmas, and moral precepts as benefitting sentient beings. Patience (*kṣānti*) is of three kinds: patience with regard to resentment and injury [on the part of others], patience

of accepting suffering calmly, and patience in the investigation of dharmas. Vigor (*vīrya*) is of three kinds: vigor of great resolve, vigor in embracing the wholesome, and vigor in benefitting and gladdening [others]. Trance states (*dhyāna*) are of three kinds: trance states as peaceful dwelling, trance states that attract [paranormal abilities], and trance states for transacting one's affairs [as a bodhisattva].

Discernment is of three kinds: nondiscriminating discernment of the emptiness of beings, nondiscriminating discernment of the emptiness of dharmas, and nondiscriminating discernment of both [kinds of] emptiness. Skill in means (*upāya-kauśalya*) is of two kinds: skill in means in turning [toward awakening] and skill in means in rescuing [other beings]. Vows (*praṇidhāna*) are of two kinds: vows of seeking *bodhi* and vows of benefitting and gladdening [others]. Power is of two kinds: power of reflection and power of cultivation. Knowledge (*jñāna*) is of two kinds: knowledge as enjoying the happiness of the Dharma [for oneself] and knowledge of bringing sentient beings to [spiritual] maturity.

With regard to the natures of these ten, giving has as its nature the absence of craving, along with the three actions [of body, speech, and mind] that are engendered by it. Moral precepts have as their nature the three actions of the time of accepting and learning the bodhisattva's moral precepts. Patience has as its nature nonhatred, vigor, investigative discernment, and the three actions generated by them. Vigor has as its nature effort and the three actions generated by it. Trance states have as their nature just *samādhi*. The last five all have as their nature investigation of dharmas, because it is said that they are fundamental knowledge [in the case of the sixth perfection] and subsequently acquired knowledge [in the case of the last four].

There is an interpretation that the eighth [perfection] has as its nature desire, resolve, and faith, because vows have these three as its nature. This [above discussion] concerns the natures [of the ten perfections]. If we combine each with its retinue, each has as its nature all the accompanying virtues.

51c In order for these ten characteristics to qualify as perfections, they must [each] be assisted by seven kinds of excellence: (1) excellence of installation, that is, one must be installed in the disposition (*gotra*) of bodhisattvas; (2) excellence of support, that is, one must be supported by the great thought of awakening; (3) excellence of aspiration, that is, one must have compassion for all sentient beings; (4) excellence of occupation, that is, they must be accompanied by the excellence of all endeavors; (5) excellence of means, that is, they must be accompanied by imageless knowledge; (6) excellence of dedicating, that is, one must dedicate [one's virtues] to supreme *bodhi*; (7) excellence of purity, that is, [perfections] must not be mixed with the two obstacles.

If [each perfection] is not assisted by these seven kinds of excellence, the giving, etc., that are practiced do not reach the other shore [i.e., are not *pāramitā*]. Consequently, giving, etc., insofar as being perfections, must be distinguished with the four alternatives [i.e., giving that is not a perfection, perfection that is not giving, giving that is also a perfection, and nongiving that is nonperfection].

As for there being only ten [perfections] and no more or less, this is because in the ten stages one must counteract ten obstacles and realize ten [kinds of] true suchness, no more, no less.

Furthermore, as for the first six not being more or less, this is because one expels opposing obstacles of six characteristics [such as greed, immorality, etc.], because one gradually cultivates the various Buddha dharmas, and because one gradually matures sentient beings. These should be understood in accordance with the extensive discussion of other treatises.

Also, the [first] three of giving, etc., are the path of promotion (*abhyudaya*), because they promote great wealth, a body [fit for practice], and [good] companions. The [last] three such as vigor, etc., are the path of decisive triumph, because one is able to subdue the passions and mature sentient beings and the Buddha dharmas. All bodhisattva paths are made up of only these two.

Also, the first three benefit sentient beings, because one benefits [them] by giving goods, one does not injure them, and one is patient in the face of their vexations. The [last] three of vigor,

etc., counteract the passions, because, although [the fourth] does not yet subdue the passions, still it stimulates the wholesome added efforts that counteract them; and [the fifth and sixth] eternally subdue and eternally destroy the passions.

Also, due to giving, etc., one does not dwell in *nirvāṇa*, and, due to the last three, one does not dwell in *saṃsāra*. They are preparations for the *nirvāṇa* with no fixed abode (*apraṭiṣṭhita-nirvāṇa*). Consequently, these first six [perfections] neither increase nor decrease [in number].

The reason why there are only four of the last ones is that they assist the first six and cause their perfection, so they neither increase nor decrease. This is because skill in means aids [the first] three of giving, etc., vows assist vigor, power assists *samādhi*, and knowledge assists discernment and makes it grow. These should be understood in accordance with the full explanation in the *Samdhinirmocana Sūtra*.

The reason for the order of the ten is that succeeding ones are attracted and produced by the previous ones and because the previous ones are confirmed and purified by succeeding ones. Also, the former are gross [compared with the successor] and succeeding ones are subtle; and they are easy or difficult to cultivate [respectively]. Hence the order.

The explanation of the general name ["perfection"] and the specific names ["giving," etc.] are as explained elsewhere.

Regarding the cultivation of these ten, there are five kinds of cultivation: (1) cultivation supported by qualifications [such as vows, etc.]; (2) cultivation supported by intention; (3) cultivation supported by mental disposition; (4) cultivation supported by skill in means (*upāya*); and (5) cultivation supported by freedom. Supported by these five kinds of cultivation, one cultivates ten perfections and is able to perfect them. Their characteristics are as discussed in the *Abidharmasamuccaya* and elsewhere.

As for what they include, each of the ten includes all [other] perfections, because they are interrelated. The reason the successor is attracted through the support of the cultivation of the predecessor is that the former includes the successor, which necessarily

52a requires the former. The successor does not include the former because [the former] does not require the successor. The former is confirmed and purified by the support of the cultivation of the successor because the successor includes the former and confirms and purifies the former. The former does not include the successor because [the former] does not confirm and purify [the successor]. With regard to cultivation of the basis of simplicity or mixture, there are four alternatives in their mutual relationship [i.e., giving that is not a perfection, perfection that is not giving, etc.].

The reason there are really ten but said to be six is that you must understand that the last four are included in the sixth [i.e., discernment]. The reason they are broken down into ten is that the sixth includes nondiscriminating knowledge and the last four are all categorized as subsequently acquired knowledge, because its object is worldly [truth].

As for the result of these ten, four are impure, excluding the result of disentanglement. Four are pure, excluding result as retribution. Still, some sources say that [the perfections] have five results, which is claimed on the basis of their mutual assistance or due to the combining of the two [i.e., impure and pure].

The ten [perfections] and the threefold learning (*śikṣā*) are mutually related. Learning consisting of moral precepts is threefold: (1) moral precepts as conduct, that is, correct avoidance of dharmas that one should avoid; (2) moral precepts as embracing good dharmas, that is, correctly cultivating and realizing dharmas that one should cultivate and realize; and (3) moral precepts as benefitting sentient beings, that is, correctly benefitting and gladdening sentient beings. These are common and noncommon to the two vehicles. Their great depth and vastness is as discussed in other sources.

There are four [kinds] of learning consisting of *samādhi*: (1) the *samādhi* of the brilliant light of the Mahayana, that is, because it can emit the brilliant light of knowledge that thoroughly illuminates the principles, teachings, practices, and results of the Mahayana; (2) *samādhi* like a king in accumulating merits, that

is, because it freely accumulates boundless merits in the same way that the power of a king is unequalled; (3) *samādhi* that protects virtue, that is, because it can protect supramundane and mundane virtuous good dharmas; and (4) *samādhi* practiced by heroes, that is, because it is practiced by the great heroic beings, Buddhas and bodhisattvas. The objects, counteragents, great capacities, results, and activities of these four are as discussed in other places.

Learning as discernment is threefold: (1) nondiscriminating discernment of added effort; (2) fundamental nondiscriminating discernment; and (3) subsequently acquired nondiscriminating discernment. The nature, support, causal conditions, objects, and activities, etc., of these are as discussed in other sources.

These three discernments all exist in the first two states [i.e., state of class, or *gotra*, and state of equipment] as seeds, and as actualities only in [the state of] added effort. Two [discernments] are manifested in the state of thorough understanding, and three exist as seeds, because there is no added effort in the state of the path of insight. In the state of cultivation, the three kinds [of discernment] exist as seeds or actualities up through the seventh stage, and from the eighth stage on, two are actualities and three are seeds, because the effortless path is contrary to added effort, and because all functioning of advancement arises spontaneously in the pure contemplation of subsequently acquired [knowledge]. In the ultimate state, there are two [kinds of discernment] as actualities and seeds, because the actualities and seeds of added effort have both been abandoned.

In the case of inclusion by natures, [learning as] moral precepts includes [the perfection of] morality; [learning as] *samādhi* includes [the perfection of] trance states; and [learning as] discernment includes the last five [perfections]. Taking into consideration their assistants, all [three learnings and ten perfections] include each other.

In case of inclusion according to function, [learning as] moral precepts includes the first three [perfections], because they are by nature equipment, self-substance, and retinue [of the precepts].

52b [Learning as] *samādhi* includes the trance states [which are the fifth perfection], and [learning as] discernment includes the last five. Vigor includes the three learnings, because in all cases it stimulates those three.

From another point of view, [learning as] moral precepts includes the first four [perfections], because there are the first three, as above, as well as protection [in vigor]. [Learning as] *samādhi* includes trance states, and [learning as] discernment includes the last five.

With regard to the ten [perfections] and the five [states], all [ten] exist in the five states, and in the state of cultivation (*bhāvanā-avasthā*) their characteristics are most evident. However, in the first two states, the seeds [of the perfections] of bodhisattvas of sudden awakening are of the two kinds [of pure and impure] and the actualities are impure only. In bodhisattvas of gradual awakening, they are of both kinds, as seeds and as actualities, because these [bodhisattvas] have already obtained the pure contemplation of the emptiness of beings. In the state of thorough understanding, the seeds are of both kinds, and the actualities are pure only. In the state of cultivation, both seeds and actualities up to the seventh stage are both pure and impure, and from the eighth stage on, the seeds are of both kinds and actualities are pure only. In the state of culmination, [perfections] are exclusively pure whether as seeds or as actualities.

In the causal state [prior to the state of result as Buddhahood] these ten [perfections] have three kinds of names: (1) they are named “remote perfections,” that is, during the first incalculable eon, the power of giving, etc., is weak at that time and [the perfections] are subdued by the passions and are still incapable of subduing [the passions]; consequently, passions become active unintentionally; (2) they are named “proximate perfections,” that is, during the second incalculable eon, the power of giving, etc., gradually increases, they are not subdued by passions, and they are capable of subduing [passions]; consequently, passions become active [only] intentionally; (3) they are named “great perfections,” that is, during the third incalculable eon, the power of giving, etc.,

gradually increases and is capable of decisively subduing all passions; consequently, the passions never become active again. Still, this is not ultimate, because there remains the subtle obstacle to that which is to be known, both as actuality and as seeds, as well as the seeds of the passions.

There are innumerable different kinds of these ten [perfections], but out of concern for prolixity we have limited ourselves to the essentials. Even though these ten are all really cultivated in [all] ten states, still, one is cultivated in each stage in accordance with its dominant characteristics. Even though the practices of the ten stages are innumerable, all are comprised in the ten perfections.

7. The Ten Obstacles

The ten kinds of obstacle are as follows:

The [first] obstacle consists of the quality of being an ordinary being (*prthag-janatva-āvaraṇa*), that is, it arises from discrimination in the two obstacles, because ordinary beingness is established on the basis of their seeds. When the path of insight of the two vehicles appears, [their followers] only eliminate the one [kind of] seed [of the passions] and are named “acquiring the nature of saints” (*ārya*). When the path of insight of bodhisattvas appears, they eliminate the two seeds and are named “acquiring the nature of saints.” When the two paths of insight of reality appear, the seeds of those two obstacles certainly do not attain maturity. Just as light and darkness definitely do not occur together, and just as when one side of a balancing scale rises the other side sinks, so must it be with the principle of opposing dharmas. This is why there is no error [in our system] of the simultaneity of the two natures [of ordinary and *ārya*].

[The Sarvāstivādins ask,] if during the path of noninterruption (*ānantarya-mārga*) one is already devoid of the seeds of the passions, what is the use of producing the path of liberation (*vimukti-mārga*) afterwards? [We reply,] because the moments of eliminating passions and realizing their cessation are different, and because of the need to abandon the coarse natures of the class.

52c

Even though one is devoid of the seeds of the passions during the path of noninterruption, still one has not abandoned their quality of unfitness. In order to abandon that, one therefore produces the path of liberation and realizes the cessation through discrimination (*pratisaṃkyā-nirodha*), which is unconditioned, of this class [of passions]. Even though the path of insight is born and also eliminates the results of action of the evil destinies, etc., still here we now speak of passions that can generate [these results], because they are their roots.

Consequently, in the first stage it is said that one eliminates two delusions as well as their coarseness (*daṣṭhulya*). The first is the delusion of attachment to a self and dharmas, which is the obstacle consisting of the quality of being an ordinary person of these [ten obstacles]. The second is the delusion as defilement of the evil destinies, which are the results of action of the evil destinies. You should understand that the class “delusion” (*moha*) refers generally to delusions and pertains to the following as well. Alternately, that [“delusion”] refers only to the intense and weak classes of obstacles, which together generate these two delusions.

The term “coarseness” (*daṣṭhulya*) indicates the seeds of these two or the quality of unfitness generated by the two. Just as entrance into the second *samādhi* is said to eliminate the faculty of suffering, but even though the eliminated faculty of suffering is neither actual nor seeds, it still is called “coarseness,” so is it in this matter. The term “coarseness” should be understood analogously for subsequent [stages].

Although it is really the two obstacles that are eliminated by the first stage, still the intention [of the Treatise] with regard to the quality of being ordinary beings is to interpret it as [the obstacle to that] which is to be known, because it is said that “the ten [kinds of] ignorance are not defiled.” “Ignorance” is the same as the delusions of the ten categories of obstacles.

[Adherents of] the two vehicles are also able to eliminate the obstacle of the passions, and because they are common [to the two vehicles and bodhisattvas] they are not what is being referred to

here. Also, “The ten [kinds of] ignorance are not defiled” is said only on the basis of what is eliminated through cultivation during the ten stages. Even though in this stage one also subdues the passions and eliminates their coarseness, this is not the true intention [of the text]. One does not eliminate the propensities, and therefore this is not what is said.

In reality, during the path of cultivation of the first stage (*bhūmi*), one also eliminates part of the innate [obstacle to that] which is to be known. However, here, when [the text] just speaks of elimination at the very first [stage], elimination in the subsequent nine stages should be understood analogously. Since one has dwelt for a long time in the period of the stage of fulfillment, one must in reality continue to eliminate the obstacles that must be eliminated. Otherwise, there would be no differences in the paths during the three periods [i.e., three incalculable eons].

Therefore it is said that having obtained the comprehensions (*abhisamaya*), later, in the state of the path of cultivation of the ten stages, the bodhisattva only cultivates the path that eternally eliminates the obstacle to that which is to be known and retains the obstacle of the passions in order to assist his vow to accept birth [to help other sentient beings]. He is not like [those of the] two vehicles who hasten to perfect quiescence. Therefore the state of the path of cultivation does not eliminate the passions, because it is only at the time of Buddhahood that one suddenly eliminates them.

The second [obstacle] is the obstacle consisting of bad conduct (*mithyā-pratipatty-āvaraṇa*), that is, part of the obstacle to that which is to be known that is innate, along with the three actions [of body, speech, and mind] of unintentional offenses that are generated by that [obstacle]. It obstructs extremely pure moral precepts of the second stage. When one enters the second stage, one can definitely eliminate it. Consequently, the second stage is said to eliminate two delusions, along with their coarseness. The first is delusion consisting of slight unintentional offenses, which is the innate part of this [obstacle]. The second is delusion consisting of manifold actional tendencies, which are the three actions of

unintentional offenses generated by that [obstacle]. Alternately, [the two delusions] are that which generates action and the delusion of not comprehending action.

The third [obstacle] is the obstacle of dullness (*dhaṇḍhatvā-āvaraṇa*), that is, one part of the obstacle to that which is to be known that is innate. It causes forgetfulness and loss of dharmas of hearing, thought, and cultivation. It obstructs the *dhāraṇī* of superior *samādhi* of the third stage and the extraordinary three discernments that are evoked from [*samādhi*]. Upon entering the third stage one is able eternally to eliminate it.

53a

Consequently, the third stage is said to eliminate two delusions and their coarseness. The first is the delusion consisting of craving, which is among these [delusions] that which is able to obstruct superior *samādhi* and the discernment of cultivation. It is named “delusion of craving” because often in the past it was associated with [the passion of] craving. Now, [in this stage,] one acquires superior *samādhi* and what is achieved from cultivation, and, since that [obstacle] is eternally eliminated, craving is subdued accordingly, because this [passion] has evolved supported by that [obstacle] since beginningless time. The second is the obstacle regarding the *dhāraṇī* of perfect hearing and memory, which is among these [delusions] that which is able to obstruct the *dhāraṇī* and the discernment of hearing and reflection.

The fourth is the obstacle of the activity of the subtle passions (*sūkṣma-kleśa-samudācāra-āvaraṇa*), that is, part of obstacle to that which is to be known that is innate that includes the innate view of a self in the sixth consciousness. It is said to be subtle because it is the lowest class, it is not conditioned by attention, and it has been active from long ago. It obstructs dharmas that are aids to *bodhi* in the fourth stage, and upon entry into the fourth stage one is able to eliminate it eternally. It is given the name of passion because formerly it often arose with the same substance as the view that grasps [something] as a self that arises spontaneously in the sixth consciousness. Now, in the fourth stage, since one has acquired pure dharmas that are aids to *bodhi*, that

[obstacle] is eternally eliminated, and the view of a self, etc., are also eternally inactive. In the first, second, and third stages, the characteristics of the practice of giving, morality, and cultivation are the same as those of worldly people. In the fourth stage, one cultivates and acquires the dharmas that are aids to *bodhi* [and morality, etc.], and then they are named “supramundane.” Therefore one is able eternally to destroy the two [forms of] views of self, etc.

How do we know that this [view of self] is associated with the sixth consciousness? Because attachment to a self and views, etc., associated with the seventh consciousness are opposed to the nature of the pure path. From the eighth stage on, they are eternally inactive, but up to the seventh stage they may still occur, because they act as supports for other passions. These are coarse and subtle [respectively, as they occur associated with either the sixth or the seventh consciousness,] and there is a sequence in subduing them. Therefore this [view of self, etc.] is only associated with the sixth consciousness.

The words “view of self, etc.” also include the beginningless obstacle to that which is to be known, and includes love for *samādhi* and love for the Dharma. That love for *samādhi* and the Dharma have further increased in the [first] three stages, and upon entering the fourth stage one is able eternally to eliminate them, because the dharmas that are aids to *bodhi* especially oppose them.

Consequently, the fourth stage is said to eliminate two obstacles as well as their coarseness. The first is the delusion consisting of love for trance states, which is that among these that accompanies love for *samādhi*. The second is the delusion consisting of love for the Dharma, which is that among these that accompanies love for the Dharma. Because of the elimination of the two delusions included in the obstacle to that which is to be known, the passions that are the two [kinds of] love are also never active again.

The fifth [obstacle] is the obstacle of the final *nirvāṇa* of the lower vehicles (*hīnayāna-parinirvāṇa-āvaraṇa*), that is, part of the obstacle to that which is to be known that is innate. It causes

dislike for *saṃsāra* and anticipation of *nirvāṇa* and is the same as dislike for *saṃsāra* and delight in its destruction. It obstructs the path of nondifferentiation of the fifth stage, and upon entry into the fifth stage one can eternally eliminate it. Consequently, the fifth stage is said to eliminate two delusions and their coarseness. The first is the delusion of exclusively intending to turn one's back on *saṃsāra*, which is of these that which dislikes *saṃsāra*. The second is the delusion of exclusively intending to turn toward

53b

nirvāṇa, which is of these that which delights in *nirvāṇa*.
The sixth [obstacle] is the obstacle of the activity of coarse characteristics (*sthūla-nimitta-samudācāra-āvaraṇa*), that is, part of the obstacle to that which is to be known that is innate, consisting of the grasping of the activity of coarse characteristics of defilement and purity. It obstructs the path of neither defilement nor purity of the sixth stage, and upon entry into the sixth stage one is able eternally to eliminate it. Consequently, the sixth stage is said to eliminate two delusions and their coarseness. The first is the delusion consisting of contemplating the evolving of karmic forces (*saṃskāra*), which is of these that which grasps impurity, because the evolving of karmic forces is categorized as part of impurity. The second is the delusion concerning the activity of numerous characteristics, which is of these that which is attached to purity, because one grasps the characteristic of purity. Contemplation of characteristics is frequently carried out, and one is still unable to abide for a long time in contemplation devoid of characteristics.

The seventh [obstacle] is the obstacle of the activity of subtle characteristics (*sūkṣma-nimitta-samudācāra-āvaraṇa*), that is, part of the obstacle to that which is to be known that is innate, which is attachment to the activity of subtle characteristics of birth and cessation. It obstructs the marvellous path devoid of characteristics of the seventh stage, and upon entering the seventh stage one is able eternally to eliminate it. Consequently, the seventh stage is said to eliminate two obstacles and their coarseness. The first is the delusion concerning the activity of subtle characteristics, which

is of these that which is attachment to birth, because one still grasps the subtle characteristics of birth. The second is the delusion consisting of the exclusive intention to seek characteristiclessness, which is of these that which is attachment to cessation, because one still grasps, as before, the cessation of subtle characteristics of cessation. One intends energetically to seek characteristiclessness exclusively and is still unable to generate the superior practice of [contemplating] existence [in the contemplation of] emptiness.

The eighth [obstacle] is the obstacle of carrying out additional practices in [contemplating] characteristiclessness (*nirnimitta-abhisamṣkāra-āvaraṇa*), that is, part of the obstacle to that which is to be known that is innate, which prevents contemplation devoid of characteristics from occurring freely. In the first five stages, contemplation with characteristics is frequent, while contemplation devoid of characteristics is infrequent. In the sixth stage, contemplation with characteristics is infrequent, while contemplation devoid of characteristics is frequent. The seventh stage is exclusively contemplation devoid of characteristics, and even though it always continues in an unbroken series, still there is added effort.

Because of the existence of added effort in the contemplation devoid of characteristics, one is not yet able freely to manifest characteristics and lands. These added efforts obstruct the effortless path of the eighth stage, and therefore when one enters the eighth stage one can eternally eliminate it, and because it is eternally eliminated one acquires two masteries. Consequently, the eighth stage is said to eliminate two delusions and their coarseness. The first is the delusion of making an effort in regard to characteristiclessness. The second is the delusion of not having mastery with regard to characteristics. Because one is prevented from mastery over characteristics, this also includes lands, because they are part of characteristics.

From the eighth stage on, because the exclusively pure path arises spontaneously, the passions of the three realms are never active again. The subtle obstacle to that which is to be known of the

seventh consciousness can still appear, because the knowledge of the emptiness of beings and its results do not oppose that [obstacle].

The ninth [obstacle] is the obstacle consisting of not desiring to practice benefitting others (*parahita-caryā-akāmana-āvaraṇa*), that is, part of the obstacle to that which is to be known that is innate that causes one not to desire to practice diligently in order to benefit and gladden sentient beings but to enjoy cultivating one's own benefit. It obstructs the four unobstructed analytical knowledges of the ninth stage, and upon entering the ninth stage one is able eternally to eliminate it. Consequently, the ninth stage is said to eliminate two delusions and their coarseness.

The first [delusion] is the delusion concerning mastery of the innumerable dharmas that have been taught, innumerable names, phrases, and syllables, and continuous quick-witted eloquence. "Mastery of the innumerable dharmas that have been taught" is the unobstructed analytical knowledge regarding meaning, which means mastery over what is explained, [so called] because all meanings are revealed in a single meaning. "Mastery of innumerable names, phrases, and syllables" is the unobstructed analytical knowledge of dharmas, which means mastery over that which explains, because all names, phrases, and syllables are revealed in a single name, phrase, or syllable. "Mastery of continuous quick-witted eloquence" is unobstructed mastery of language, which means mastery in uninterrupted exposition of sounds of words, because all sounds are revealed in a single sound.

The second [delusion] is the delusion regarding mastery of debate. "Mastery of debate" is unobstructed explanation in debate, because one skillfully grasps the suitability of capacities [of beings] in order to preach to them. Delusions can obstruct these four kinds of masteries and all are included in the obstacles to the ninth [stage].

The tenth [obstacle] is the obstacle of not yet acquiring mastery over all dharmas, that is, part of the obstacle to that which is to be known that is innate, which prevents mastery over all dharmas from being acquired. It obstructs the great cloud of knowledge of dharmas of the tenth stage along with what is stored [in

the cloud] and activities produced by it. Upon entering the tenth stage one is able eternally to eliminate it.

Consequently, the tenth stage is said to eliminate two delusions and their coarseness. The first is the delusion regarding great supernatural powers (*abhijñā*), which is of these that which obstructs activities produced by [knowledge]. The second is the delusion regarding awakening to the subtle mysteries, which is of these that which obstructs the great cloud of knowledge of dharmas and that which it stores.

Even though in this stage one acquires mastery over dharmas, still obstacles remain, so this is not called the ultimate. That is, there are innate obstacles to that which is to be known that are subtle, as well as seeds of the spontaneous obstacle of the passions. When the Diamond-like *Samādhi* appears, those [obstacles] are suddenly eliminated and one enters the stage of Tathāgata.

Consequently, the stage of Buddhahood is said to eliminate two delusions, as well as their coarseness. The first is the delusion consisting of an extremely subtle attachment to all known objective realms, which is of these that subtle obstacle to that which is to be known. The second is the delusion that is an extremely subtle hindrance, which is of these all seeds of the spontaneous obstacle of the passions.

Therefore the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* says, “When one obtains *bodhi*, one suddenly eliminates the passions and the obstacle to that which is to be known, because one becomes an arhat and a Tathāgata and realizes great *nirvāṇa* and great *bodhi*.”

These eleven obstacles are all included in the two obstacles [i.e., the obstacle of the passions and the obstacle to that which is to be known]. Seeds of the obstacle of the passions to be eliminated by [the path of] insight are first eliminated [on the path of insight] in the stage of “Extreme Joy.” The actual [passions] of that obstacle have already been subdued prior to this stage. All the seeds that are to be eliminated by cultivation are suddenly eliminated with the presence of the Diamond-like *Samādhi*. The actual [passions] of that obstacle have already been subdued

54a

gradually before this stage. From the first stage on, one is able suddenly to subdue them completely, like an arhat, and prevent their activity forever. As a result, even though [the passions] may appear from time to time through the power of will during the first seven stages, nevertheless this is no fault, and from the eighth stage on they are absolutely inactive.

Seeds of the obstacle to that which is to be known to be eliminated by [the path of] insight are first eliminated on the path of insight in the “Joyous” stage. The actual [passions] of that obstacle have already been subdued prior to that stage. Seeds to be eliminated by [the path of] cultivation are gradually eliminated during the ten stages. Once the Diamond-like *Samādhi* is present, they are eternally eliminated. The actual [passions] of that obstacle have been gradually subdued prior to this stage, and upon arrival at the tenth stage they are eternally eliminated completely.

From the eighth stage on, that [obstacle] associated with the sixth consciousness is not again active, because mind in pure contemplation and its results continue in a series and are able to oppose it. That associated with the seventh [consciousness] may still be active. It is subdued with the appearance of the state of knowledge of the emptiness of dharmas and its results. While it is admitted that the first five consciousnesses that evolve have not yet had the transmutation of the support, the obstacle does not appear because of suppression of the Pure [contemplation].

Although on the path of cultivation in the ten stages one does not entirely destroy the seeds of the obstacle to that which is to be known, their coarseness is gradually destroyed, and consequently it is therefore said that each of the coarsenesses of the two obstacles is eliminated during three abodes (*vihāra*). Even though coarseness is eliminated in all states, the three states are prominent [in this elimination], and therefore [the above statement] is made in a one-sided manner.

How does one eliminate the seeds of the two obstacles, gradually or suddenly? Seeds of the obstacle of the passions associated with the seventh consciousness are eliminated suddenly in a single instant at the time when those of the three vehicles are about to

acquire the result consisting of being a post-learner. All seeds of the obstacle to that which is to be known are suddenly eliminated in a single instant at the moment of becoming a Buddha, because they occur spontaneously and internally without [the distinction of] coarse or subtle.

Seeds of the obstacle of the passions associated with the other six consciousnesses eliminated by [the path of] insight are all suddenly eliminated by those of the three vehicles on the path of insight of reality in the state of insight. Those to be eliminated by cultivation [are eliminated] as the case may be. One species [of individual] of the two vehicles eliminates one class of the nine categories [of passions] gradually, one after another, in each of the nine stages of the three realms. Another species of the two vehicles combines [seeds of] the nine stages of the three realms into one group and eliminates the nine categories separately. The bodhisattva about to generate the Diamond-like *Samādhi* suddenly eliminates [the seeds of] the three realms in a single instant.

54b

All the seeds of the obstacle to that which is to be known to be eliminated by insight are suddenly eliminated in the first moment of the first stage. Those to be eliminated by cultivation are gradually and progressively eliminated afterwards in the state of path of cultivation of the ten stages, and upon properly generating the Diamond-like *Samādhi* they are totally eliminated in a single instant. They originate with internal and external objects that are coarse or subtle, so there are many distinctions of class and species.

Faculties of [followers of] the two vehicles are dull. When they gradually eliminate the obstacles, they must [for each category of seeds] separately generate [the path of] noninterruption and [the path of] liberation, and added effort and superior progress, either separately or in general. The bodhisattva with keen faculties in the state of gradual elimination of obstacles need not separately generate [the paths of] noninterruption and liberation, because he is capable of eliminating them and realizing [the result] instant by instant. The four [paths] of added effort, etc., may all exist from the standpoint of each other instant by instant in the sequence.

8. The Ten True Suchnesses

The ten true suchnesses (*tathatā*) are: (1) universal true suchness (*sarvatraḡa-tathatā*), that is, because there is not a single dharma in which this true suchness revealed by the twofold emptiness does not dwell; (2) supreme true suchness (*parama-tathatā*), that is, because this true suchness is endowed with limitless qualities and is preeminent among all dharmas; (3) true suchness that is the supreme outflow (*parama-niṣyanda-tathatā*), that is, because the teachings that flow from this true suchness are most preeminent among teachings; (4) unappropriated true suchness (*aparigraha-tathatā*), that is, because this true suchness is unaffiliated with the grasping of a self, etc., and not their support not grasped by them; (5) true suchness undifferentiated as to species (*abhinna-jātiya-tathatā*), that is, because this true suchness is undifferentiated as to species, unlike the eye, etc., where there is a difference of species; (6) true suchness devoid of defilement and purity (*asaṃkṣiṣṭa-avyavadāta-tathatā*), that is, because this true suchness is essentially devoid of defilement and cannot be said to become pure later; (7) true suchness as nondifferentiation of the Dharma (*abhinna-tathatā*), that is, because even though this true suchness is manifold [in terminology] in the teachings and is defined in many ways, it still is not different; (8) true suchness that neither increases nor decreases (*anupacaya-apacaya-tathatā*), that is, because this true suchness is not grasped as increasing or decreasing and does not increase through purity or decrease through defilement; this [true suchness] is also named “true suchness as support of mastery over characteristics and lands (*kṣetra*) created through an act of will,” that is, because having realized this true suchness, one has mastery in manifesting characteristics [such as water, jewels, etc.] and lands; (9) true suchness that is the support of mastery of knowledge (*jñāna-vaṣitā-saṃniṣṭaya-tathatā*), that is because having realized this true suchness, one acquires mastery over unobstructed analytical knowledge; (10) true suchness that is the support of mastery over actions, etc. (*kriyādi-vaṣitā-saṃniṣṭaya-tathatā*), that is because having realized this true suchness one has universal

mastery over all supernatural powers (*abhijñā*), actions [of body, speech, and mind], and the methods (*mukha*) of *dharaṇī* and *samādhi*.

Although true suchness is by nature really devoid of distinctions, ten kinds are conventionally established with reference to pre-eminent qualities [realized by bodhisattvas]. Even though in the first stage [a bodhisattva] has already comprehended all [ten], he is nevertheless imperfect in realizing and practicing them. They are given as being ten in order that they may be progressively perfected.

9. Transmutation of the Support and Its Results

In this way, during the ten stages, the bodhisattva vigorously cultivates ten superior practices (*pāramitā*), eliminates ten kinds of obstacles, realizes ten [kinds of] true suchness, and is able to realize the twofold transmutation of the support.

There are, generally speaking, six states of the transmutation of the support:

54c

(1) Transmutation by breaking the power [of impure seeds] and increasing the efficacy [of pure seeds] (*balodghāta-prabhāva-vardhana-parāvṛtti*), that is, during the first two states [of equipment and added effort], through practice of resolve, conscience, and shame, one therefore breaks the power of defiled seeds in the root consciousness and increases the efficacy of pure seeds within root consciousness; even though one has not yet eliminated the seeds of the obstacles and truly realized the transmutation of the support, nevertheless one subdues the actual [forms of the obstacles] little by little, so this is also called “transmutation.”

(2) Transmutation as thorough understanding (*prativēdha-parāvṛtti*), that is, the state of thorough understanding. As a result of the power of the path of insight, one thoroughly understands true suchness and eliminates the coarseness of the two obstacles born of discrimination, and realizes true transmutation of the support partially.

(3) Transmutation as cultivation (*bhāvanā-parāvṛtti*), that is, the state of cultivation. As a result of repeatedly cultivating the practices of the ten stages, one therefore gradually eliminates the coarseness of the innate two obstacles and gradually realizes the true transmutation of the support. It is said in the *Mahāyānasamgraha* that transmutation of thorough understanding occurs during the first six stages, because during thorough understanding of the true and false of the contemplation with characteristics (*sanimitta*) and the contemplation of characteristiclessness (*nirnimitta*), [the contemplations] appear alternately, causing the true and not true to be present or not present. [The above text also] says that the transmutation as cultivation occurs during the following four stages, because contemplation devoid of characteristics appears [then] for an extended period without mixture [with the contemplation with characteristics], and vigorous cultivation eliminates the remaining coarseness, often preventing the not true from appearing.

(4) Transmutation as the perfection of result (*phala-paripūri-parāvṛtti*), that is, the state of culmination (*niṣṭhā-avasthā*). As a result of three great eons or incalculable [eons] of cultivation and accumulation of boundless difficult practices and superior practices, when the Diamond-like *Samādhi* appears, one eternally eliminates all intrinsic coarseness and suddenly realizes the perfect transmutation of the support that is the result, Buddhahood, which is endless and benefits and gladdens [beings] inexhaustibly.

(5) Inferior transmutation (*hīna-parāvṛtti*), that is, the state of the two [non-Mahayana] vehicles. Exclusively seeking self-benefit, fearing suffering and delighting in quiescence, able only to understand thoroughly true suchness as the emptiness of beings, eliminating the seeds of the passions, experiencing true cessation through discrimination (*prati-samkhyā-nirodha*), and lacking superior abilities is called “inferior transmutation.”

(6) Great transmutation (*vipula-parāvṛtti*), that is, the state of the Mahayana. Advancing to great *bodhi* in order to benefit others, neither fearing *saṃsāra* nor delighting in *nirvāṇa*, possessing the ability to understand thoroughly the true suchness of the twofold emptiness, eliminating seeds of both the obstacle of the passions and the obstacle to that which is to be known, suddenly realizing supreme *bodhi* and *nirvāṇa*, and having superior ability is named “great transmutation.”

Of these [forms of transmutation], it is the great transmutation that is spoken of [in Vasubandhu’s verses] because it abandons the twofold coarseness and realizes [both *bodhi* and *nirvāṇa*].

The meaning of “transmutation” varies, being in brief of four kinds.

(1) The path that can transmute is twofold. The first is the path that can subdue, that is, it subdues the power of the propensities of the two obstacles and prevents the attraction and generation of the two actual obstacles. This is of two paths, the impure and pure, and of three kinds of knowledge, which are [those consisting of] added effort, fundamental, and subsequently acquired. It subdues gradually or suddenly, as the case may be. The second [path that transmutes] is that which can eliminate the propensities of the two obstacles [rather than just subduing them]. This path is definitely not impure or [knowledge of] added effort, because the impure path has already been cultivated, attracted by the grasping of characteristics, and it has not yet dissolved the characteristics, and because [knowledge of] added effort aspires to that [true suchness] that is to be realized and [knowledge] that is to be attracted, and it has not yet accomplished this.

There is an interpretation that fundamental nondiscriminating knowledge immediately realizes the truth revealed by the twofold emptiness and is devoid of objects and characteristics, and therefore it can eliminate the propensities.

55a

This not being so concerning subsequently acquired [knowledge], it therefore is not a path of elimination. According to another interpretation, even though subsequently acquired nondiscriminating knowledge does not immediately realize the truth of the twofold emptiness and lacks the power to eliminate the propensities of delusion regarding truth, nevertheless it clearly realizes, nonerroneously and as if present, established and nonestablished characteristics (*vyavasthita-avyavasthita-lakṣaṇa*; i.e., the four noble truths and true suchness respectively), and therefore it is also capable of eternally eliminating the propensities of delusion concerning events.

Therefore the *Yogacārabhūmi Śāstra* says, “In the state of the path of cultivation, there exists a supramundane path of elimination and [both] supramundane and mundane paths of elimination. The purely mundane path lacks the ability to destroy eternally the propensities because it has been practiced previously and because it was attracted by attachment to characteristics.” The consequence of this argument is that various delusions concerning truth that are to be eliminated by insight or by cultivation can only be truly eliminated through fundamental nondiscriminating knowledge that immediately realizes the truth. The remaining propensities of delusion concerning events to be eliminated by cultivation can be truly eliminated by both root and subsequently acquired [knowledge].

(2) The second [meaning of transmutation] is the support that is transmuted. This is also twofold. The first is the support that bears the seeds; that is, root consciousness [i.e., the eighth consciousness]. As a result of its ability to bear the seeds of defiled and pure dharmas and to occur together with defiled and pure dharmas, it is their support. The holy path transmutes it and causes it to reject the defiled and to acquire the pure. Even those of the nature of being dependent on others [*paratantra*, the other seven consciousnesses]

are also supports; nevertheless, they cannot bear seeds and therefore are not said to be transmuted.

The second [support that is transmuted] is the support of delusion and awakening, that is, true suchness. Inasmuch as it is able to act as the root of delusion and awakening, defiled and pure dharmas are born with it as their support. The holy path transmutes it and causes it to reject the defiled and acquire the pure. Even though the other [nature, the dependent] is also a support for dharmas of delusion and awakening, it is nevertheless not their root, and therefore it is not said [to be transmuted].

(3) The third [meaning of transmutation] is that which is rejected by transmutation. This is also twofold. The first is that which is rejected through elimination, that is, the seeds of the two obstacles. When the true path of noninterruption (*ānantarya-mārga*) appears and counteracts them and opposes them so that they never again are completed [as actual dharmas], they are said to be rejected. Because the seeds are eliminated, the falsely grasped self and dharmas are not grasped again. The falsely grasped self and dharmas not corresponding to false notions are also said to be rejected. Thus, it is said to be the rejection of the discriminated [nature]. The second [form of rejection] is rejection by neglect, that is, remaining impure [seeds] and inferior pure seeds [not to be actually eliminated]. When the Diamond-like *Samādhi* is present, it attracts a totally perfect, clear, pure root consciousness that does not support them. Therefore, all are eternally rejected by neglecting them.

The seeds having been eliminated, actual impure dharmas and inferior pure [dharmas] are not again born. Since they are eternally unproduced, they are said to be rejected. Consequently, this is said to be the rejection of the inferior dharmas of *saṃsāra*.

There is an interpretation that the seeds of impure dharmas and inferior pure [dharmas] are all rejected by

neglecting them at the moment the Diamond-like *Samādhi* is present, because they are rejected simultaneously with the seeds of the two obstacles. According to another interpretation, they have not yet been rejected at that time, because they are not in opposition to the path of noninterruption, because [in that moment] the bodhisattva would have no dharmas of *saṃsāra*, because in this state [the bodhisattva] would be devoid of a perfumed consciousness, because he would be called “Buddha” while dwelling on the path of noninterruption; and the subsequent path of liberation [which follows directly after the preceding path] would have no function.

55b

Consequently, you should know that remaining impure [seeds], etc., are rejected by neglecting them just when the path of liberation arises, because the pure eighth consciousness does not support them.

(4) The fourth meaning [of transmutation] is that which is obtained by transmutation. This is also twofold [*nirvāṇa* and *bodhi*].

Chapter XII

Nirvāṇa

The first is that acquired through manifestation, that is, great *nirvāṇa*. Although it is intrinsically pure by nature, nevertheless it is made to be unmanifest as a result of the veiling of adventitious obstacles. When the real holy path arises, it eliminates those obstacles and therefore causes its characteristics to be manifested. This is called “attaining *nirvāṇa*.” Inasmuch as it is defined as true suchness divorced from obstacles, its substance is therefore the pure realm of the Dharma.

The meaning of *nirvāṇa* is distinguished in four ways.

(1) *Nirvāṇa* that is intrinsically pure by nature (*anādikālika-prakṛti-śuddha-nirvāṇa*), that is, the principle of true suchness as the characteristic of all dharmas. Though it has adventitious defilements, it is nevertheless intrinsically pure by nature, endowed with innumerable subtle and marvelous qualities, devoid of origination and extinction, tranquil like space, the same in all beings and common to all, neither the same as nor different from all dharmas, apart from all characteristics and discrimination, beyond the path of investigation and cut off from the path of names and words, realized only within by true saints, and essentially tranquil by nature, hence the name *nirvāṇa*.

(2) *Nirvāṇa* with remaining support (*sopadhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa*), that is, true suchness free from the obstacle of the passions. Even though the support for subtle suffering has not ended, still the obstacle has been eternally stilled, hence it is called *nirvāṇa*.

(3) *Nirvāṇa* without remainder (*nirupadhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa*), that is, true suchness freed of the suffering of *saṃsāra*. The passions having been exhausted, the remaining support is also destroyed and the mass of suffering is eternally stilled, therefore it is called *nirvāṇa*.

(4) *Nirvāṇa* with no fixed abode (*apraṭiṣṭhita-nirvāṇa*), i.e., true suchness freed from the obstacle to that which is to be known. It is always assisted by great compassion (*mahā-karuṇā*) and great discernment, and as a consequence one does not dwell in *saṃsāra* or *nirvāṇa*. Benefitting and gladdening beings is eternal. One functions in the world [due to compassion] but is eternally quiescent, therefore it is called *nirvāṇa*.

All beings possess the first [*nirvāṇa*]. Post-learners of the two vehicles may possess the first three. Only our World-Honored One may be said to have [all] four.

How can the Sugata [i.e., the Buddha] have remaining support (*upādhi*)? Although he has no real support, he seems to have it. Alternately, the support of suffering having been exhausted, he can be said to be without support. Support remains but not the [support of] suffering, so he may be said to have the support. Therefore the World-Honored One may be said to have the four [forms of *nirvāṇa*].

If disciples (*śrāvaka*), etc., have [*nirvāṇa*] without remaining support, why are there sources [such as the *Śrīmālādevī Sūtra*] that say that they do not have it? Some sources may say that they lack *nirvāṇa* totally. Can it be that they also do not have [*nirvāṇa*] without remaining support?

Indeed, while body and knowing [i.e., mind] exist in disciples, etc., they still retain the obstacle to that which is to be known, and since the support of suffering [i.e., the body] is not exhausted, the sense of perfect quiescence remains obscure, so it is said that they do not have *nirvāṇa*. It does not mean that they are devoid of the reality that is *nirvāṇa* with remainder that is revealed by the termination of the obstacle of the passions. At that time, they

still have not realized the perfect quiescence without remainder and are therefore also said to be without [*nirvāṇa*] without remaining support. It does not mean that later, when body and knowing have ceased, they will not have an end to the support of suffering and *nirvāṇa* without remainder. Or when [the above sources] say that [adherents of] the two vehicles are devoid of *nirvāṇa*, they are referring to [*nirvāṇa*] with no fixed abode, not the other three [*nirvāṇas*]. 55c

Also, when it is said [by the above sources] that those [members of the two vehicles] do not have [*nirvāṇa*] without remaining support, they are referring to those of the two vehicles with indeterminate natures. When they have just realized *nirvāṇa* with remainder, they resolutely turn their thoughts to seeking supreme enlightenment. Through the power of *samādhi* and vows, they retain their bodies and remain [in *samsāra*] for a long time, unlike one type who enters [*nirvāṇa*] without remaining support. That is, there exist [those of] the two vehicles who have a profound delight in perfect quiescence, who acquire the contemplation of the emptiness of beings and immediately realize true suchness, eternally destroy the obstacle of the passions that induce birth utterly, and immediately realize *nirvāṇa* with remaining [support] based on truth. Because the passions that can induce birth are exhausted, there is no basis for subsequent birth as retribution.

In the state where the present support of suffering is destroyed spontaneously, other conditioned dharmas lack a support and are suddenly rejected simultaneously with the support of suffering. This reveals the *nirvāṇa* without remainder based on truth. Even though at that time the bodies and knowing of [adherents of] the two vehicles do not exist, as a result of that [previous] realization, that [*nirvāṇa* without remainder] can be said to exist. In this state, there is only pure true suchness divorced from characteristics, calm, tranquil, and blissful. Based on this, it is said that they are no different from Buddhas, but they still are lacking in *bodhi* and the activity of benefitting and gladdening others, and therefore we reply that they differ from Buddhas.

Since the various obstacles to that which is to be known do not induce birth, how does one acquire nonabiding [*nirvāṇa*] by eliminating it? It is able to veil the true suchness of the emptiness of dharmas, preventing the birth of great compassion and discernment and the benefitting and gladdening of sentient beings forever. Therefore when it is eliminated, the principle of the emptiness of dharmas is revealed, and this principle is nonabiding *nirvāṇa*, because it prevents one from abiding in both extremes [of *nirvāṇa* and *saṃsāra*].

If the obstacle to that which is to be known also obstructs *nirvāṇa*, why does one not obtain cessation resulting from discrimination (*pratisaṃkhyā-nirodha*) by eliminating it? Because cessation resulting from discrimination is separation from bonds, and that [obstacle] does not bind one.

That being so, how does one acquire *nirvāṇa* by eliminating that [obstacle]? Not all [forms of] *nirvāṇa* are included in cessation resulting from discrimination. Otherwise, [*nirvāṇa*] that is pure by nature would not be *nirvāṇa*. When that which can bind sentient beings to *saṃsāra* is eliminated, one is said to acquire cessation resulting from discrimination that is unconditioned. The various obstacles to that which is to be known do not induce *saṃsāra* and are not like the passions that can bind sentient beings. Therefore one does not obtain cessation resulting from discrimination when [the obstacle] is eliminated. However, because of its elimination, the principle of the emptiness of dharmas is revealed. The characteristic of this principle being tranquility, it is said to be *nirvāṇa*, not that this *nirvāṇa* is of the nature of cessation resulting from discrimination. Therefore, of the four [kinds of] unconditioned perfect tranquility, the first and last are true suchness, while the middle two are categorized as cessation resulting from discrimination.

If one acquired cessation resulting from discrimination only by eliminating the bonds, in which of the four are the two of imperturbability (*anīṇjya*), etc., included? They are included in cessation not resulting from discrimination (*apratisaṃkhyā-nirodha*),

because they are said to be temporary separation [from bonds] and because cessation resulting from discrimination that is unconditioned is exclusively total cessation, and there is cessation not resulting from discrimination that is not eternal cessation.

Alternately, [*nirvāṇa* with] no fixed abode is included in cessation resulting from discrimination, because it is acquired with the cessation of the obstacles through the power of true discrimination (*pratisaṃkhyā*). Cessation resulting from discrimination is of two kinds: (1) that which is acquired by cessation of bonds, that is, that obtained by eliminating the passions that induce birth; (2) that which is acquired by the cessation of obstacles, that is, that which is realized when one eliminates remaining obstacles. Therefore, of the various [forms of] perfect tranquility that are unconditioned, the first is true suchness and the last three are cessation resulting from discrimination. The two of imperturbability, etc., when temporarily ending [bonds] by subduing them, are categorized as cessation not resulting from discrimination. When they totally destroy [the bonds], they are categorized as cessation resulting from discrimination.

56a

Since the obstacle to that which is to be known also obstructs *nirvāṇa*, why is it only said that it is an obstacle to *bodhi*? It is said that the obstacle of the passions only obstructs *nirvāṇa*. Is it not also able to be an obstacle to *bodhi*? You must understand that the holy teachings say this on the basis of the principle of the dominant function [of the two obstacles]. Really, both are capable of obstructing both results [i.e., *nirvāṇa* and *bodhi*]. In this way, of the four [forms of] *nirvāṇa* that were discussed, only the last three kinds are called “acquired through manifestation.”

Chapter XIII

Bodhi

The second [result of the transmutation of the support] is that which is acquired by generation, that is, great *bodhi*. Despite the intrinsic existence of seeds that can generate [*bodhi*], nevertheless it is not generated because of the obstacle to that which is to be known. Through the power of the holy path, one eliminates that obstacle and therefore causes it to arise from the seeds, which is called “acquiring *bodhi*.” Having arisen, it continues forever in a series. This [*bodhi*] consists of classes of mind associated with the four [kinds of] knowledge.

1. Classes of Mind Associated with the Four Kinds of Knowledge

What are the classes of mind associated with the four [kinds of] knowledge? The first is the class of mind [i.e., consciousness, mental activities, etc.] associated with knowledge that is like a great, perfect mirror (*mahā-ādarśana-jñāna*), that is, this class of mind is separated from all discrimination, its objects [of perception] and mode of activity are subtle and difficult to grasp, it is unforgetful and nondelusive regarding all objects, its nature and characteristics are pure and separated from all defilement, it is the support of the actual [dharmas] and the seeds of unadulterated, pure, perfect qualities, it can manifest bodies and lands and generate images of [other] knowledge, and it is incessant and uninterrupted forever, like a great, perfect mirror manifesting multitudes of images of forms.

The second is the class of mind associated with the knowledge of sameness (*samatā-jñāna*), that is, this class of mind contemplates the complete sameness of all dharmas and oneself and other sentient beings, it is always associated with great benevolence, compassion, etc., it manifests varieties of forms of bodies of enjoyment and lands in conformity with the dispositions of sentient beings, it is the special support for the knowledge of wonderful observation (*pratyaवेक्षणा-jñāna*), it is the foundation of *nirvāṇa* with no fixed abode, and it continues without change forever.

The third is the class of mind associated with knowledge of wonderful observation. That is, this class of mind skillfully contemplates the special and common characteristics of all dharmas and evolves without obstruction, it inclusively contemplates innumerable methods of *dhāraṇī* and *samādhi* as well as the jewels of virtues that are generated, it is able to manifest boundless varieties of activities in all the great assemblies and have mastery [over the activities], it rains the great rain of the Dharma and eliminates all doubts, and it causes all sentient beings to secure benefit and gladness.

The fourth is the class of mind associated with the knowledge of achieving the task (*kṛtya-anuṣṭhāna-jñāna*), that is, this class of mind manifests the three actions [of body, speech, and mind] of numerous transformations throughout space in the desire to benefit and gladden beings, and through the power of original vows it achieves all the things that should be done.

Thus even though each of the classes of mind associated with the four knowledges is without doubt made up of twenty-two dharmas [i.e., mind, mental activities, etc.] and is born simultaneously with that which transforms [i.e., the seeing part of consciousness] and that which is transformed [i.e., the seen part of consciousness], seeds and actual [results], nevertheless the function of knowing is strong, and they are indicated by the word “knowing.” Therefore these four classes include as a whole all conditioned qualities of the stage of Buddhahood without exception.

These [four kinds of knowledge] are acquired one after another by the transmutation of the class [of mental dharmas] associated with the eighth, seventh, sixth, and [first] five consciousnesses

[respectively]. Even though knowledge is not consciousness, it nevertheless evolves supported by consciousness. Inasmuch as consciousness is “king,” [knowledge] is said to be acquired by the transmutation of consciousnesses. Also, in an impure state, knowledge is weak and consciousness is strong, while in a pure state, knowledge is strong and consciousness is weak. In order to motivate sentient beings to depend on knowledge and reject consciousness, it is therefore said that one acquires these four knowledges by transmuting the eight consciousnesses.

There is an interpretation that the class of mind associated with great, perfect mirror knowledge first appears when the Diamond-like *Samādhi* is present in the bodhisattva, because both the seeds of consciousness as retribution and the seeds of the extremely subtle obstacle to that which is to be known are abandoned simultaneously, and because if at that time perfect mirror knowledge had not appeared, there would be no consciousness that can support the pure seeds.

According to another interpretation, this class is able to appear for the first time on the path of liberation when one becomes a Buddha. The seeds of consciousness as retribution have still not been rejected suddenly when the Diamond-like *Samādhi* is present, because they are not in opposition to the path of noninterruption [which directly precedes the path of liberation], because impure dharmas that are not obstacles, as well as mediocre pure dharmas, are really only opposed to the result that is Buddhahood, and the Diamond-like *Samādhi* being devoid of perfumable seeds, and pure [dharmas] not increasing, one must become a Buddha. Consequently, this class continues in a series without interruption from the beginning of Buddhahood forever into the future, because it bears pure seeds and prevents their loss.

The class of mind associated with the knowledge of sameness is able to appear for the first time in a bodhisattva when the path of insight is first present, because it opposes the twofold grasping. In the subsequent ten stages, grasping has not yet been eliminated, and therefore in states that are impure [this class of mind] may sometimes be interrupted. Following the stage of “Cloud of Dharma”

[the tenth stage], it and the purified eighth consciousness support each other, and it continues in a series forever.

The class of mind associated with knowledge of wonderful observation regarding the emptiness of beings is able to appear for the first time in the state of insight of the two vehicles and subsequently develops up to the stage of a post-learner, the stage of resolve and application (*adhimukti-cārya*) of the bodhisattva, or up to the superior states. It may appear totally if there is no impurity [of mind] or period of mindlessness [during *samādhi*]. [Mind associated with knowledge of wonderful observation] regarding the emptiness of dharmas can appear for the first time in bodhisattvas in the state of insight. This subsequently develops up to the superior states and may appear wholly if it is not impure, the result of knowledge of the emptiness of beings, or a state of mindlessness [in *samādhi*].

There is an interpretation that the class of mind associated with the knowledge of achieving the task can first appear when the bodhisattva is on the path of cultivation, because it is acquired through subsequently acquired [knowledge]. According to another interpretation, it can first appear when one becomes a Buddha, because during the ten stages [prior to Buddhahood], eyes, etc., as transformations of consciousness as retribution are not pure, because impure [dharmas] as special [supports for consciousness] must have the same object, and an organ producing a pure consciousness is not possible, because these two [i.e., impure organ and pure consciousness] differ in clarity and obscurity as far as objects are concerned. Consequently, this species [of mind] may only occur through pure organs when one becomes a Buddha. Also, it is frequently interrupted, because it arises from attention (*manaskāra*).

56c The seed natures of these four, although existing intrinsically, must be perfumed before they become active. In the causal state [prior to Buddhahood], they increase gradually, and with the result of Buddhahood, they become complete, neither increasing nor decreasing ever again. [The four knowledges] are born from seeds, but they do not perfume and create seeds, because [in that case] the qualities of former Buddhas would be superior to those of later Buddhas.

2. Objects of the Four Kinds of Knowledge

The class of mind associated with great, perfect mirror knowledge, according to one interpretation, has only true suchness as its object, because it is nondiscriminating [fundamental] knowledge, not subsequently acquired knowledge, and its mode of activity and objects are unknowable.

According to another interpretation, this class has all dharmas as objects, because the *Mahāyāna Sūtrālaṃkāra* says that great, perfect mirror knowledge is not deluded concerning all objects. The *Buddhabhūmi Sūtra* says that in a Tathāgata's mirror knowledge there appear images of all sense bases [i.e., eyes, ears, etc.], objects [i.e., forms, sounds, etc.], and [corresponding] consciousnesses. Also, [this mind] without doubt has as its objects all the impure seeds and images of bodies and lands. Also, its activities and objects are said to be unknowable due to their subtlety, but like the *ālaya* it also has as objects the convention [mundane]. With true suchness as its object, it is nondiscriminating [fundamental knowledge], and when it perceives other objects, it is subsequently acquired knowledge. Its substance is unitary but may be seen as being twofold by virtue of its functioning. It is said to be subsequently acquired because it perceives the conventional on the basis of realization of the true. Other [forms of knowledge] that are unitary but divided as twofold should be understood analogously.

The class of mind associated with the knowledge of sameness, according to one interpretation, [is pure seventh consciousness, which] has as its object only the purified eighth consciousness, because it is like the defiled seventh [consciousness], which has the store consciousness as its object. According to another interpretation, it has only true suchness as an object, because it has the sameness of all dharmas as its object. According to another interpretation [which is correct], it has both the true and the conventional as its objects, because the *Buddhabhūmi Sūtra* says that the knowledge of sameness realizes ten kinds of sameness, and because the *Mahāyāna Sūtrālaṃkāra* says that it has as an object the sameness of self and other sentient beings and, in

compliance with the disposition of others, it manifests boundless images of Buddhas. Consequently, this class [of mind] has as objects truth and convention, included in the two knowledges, with no contradiction with principle.

The class of mind associated with the knowledge of wonderful observation has as its object the specific and common characteristics of all dharmas. It is wholly devoid of obstacles and includes both [fundamental and subsequently acquired] knowledges.

The class of mind associated with knowledge of achieving the task only has as its object the five kinds of present objects, according to one interpretation, because the *Mahāyāna Sūtrālaṃkāra* says that each of the Tathāgata's five [sense] organs evolves in relation to all five [corresponding] objects. According to another interpretation, this class also is able to perceive all dharmas universally in the three times [of past, future, and present], with no violation of correct principles. The *Buddhabhūmi Sūtra* says that the knowledge of achieving the task generates and enacts the three actions [of body, speech, and mind] and the various transformation events [i.e., transformed bodies], determines the countless differences of mental activities of sentient beings, and is receptive to past, future, and present, etc., because it would not have this power if its objects were not universal.

Indeed, this class of mind may, by means of the power of disposition, have one dharma as object, two, or many. When [the *Mahāyāna Sūtrālaṃkāra*] speaks of the five organs [of a Buddha] evolving in relation to [all] five objects, it does not mean that that is all they do, so there is no disagreement [with the present position]. Because it is born from attention, bears on the characteristics of things as its objects, and gives rise to transformations and activities, it is therefore categorized as subsequently acquired knowledge.

57a Although these four classes of mind are capable of taking as objects all dharmas everywhere, nevertheless their functions differ. That is, the class of mirror knowledge manifests the body of personal enjoyment (*svasaṃbhoga-kāya*) and the characteristics of its pure land and bears pure seeds. The class of knowledge

of sameness manifests the body for the enjoyment of others (*parasam̐bhoga-kāya*) and the characteristics of its pure land. The class of knowledge of achieving the task can manifest transformation bodies (*nirmāṇa-kāya*) and the characteristics of its lands. The class of knowledge of [wonderful] observation observes the abilities and faults of oneself and others and rains the great rain of the Dharma, breaks through the net of doubts, and benefits and gladdens sentient beings. There are also many other kinds of topics such as these.

These four classes of mind are called “acquired by generation.” These “acquired by generation” are given the comprehensive name of *bodhi*, and the previous *nirvāṇa* is called “acquired by transmutation.” Despite there being, in general, four varieties of the subject of transmutation of the support, still here we have only been concerned with the two [results] acquired by transmutation, because the verses [of Vasubandhu] mention the words REALIZES THE TRANSMUTATION OF THE SUPPORT. This state of cultivation is said to be that which can bring about the realization [of *nirvāṇa* and *bodhi*], not that which is realized, because [the former] is categorized as the causal state [prior to *nirvāṇa* and *bodhi*, Buddhahood].

Chapter XIV

The Dharma Body

1. The State of Culmination

Last, what are the characteristics of the state of culmination (*niṣṭhā-avasthā*)? The [last] verse [of Vasubandhu's verses] says,

IT IS THE PURE REALM,

INCONCEIVABLE, GOOD, ETERNAL,

BLISSFUL, AND THE BODY OF LIBERATION,

WHICH IN THE GREAT MUNI IS NAMED DHARMA[*-kāya*].

The Treatise says that the transmutation of the support acquired by the former state of cultivation should be understood as the characteristic of the state of culmination. That is, it refers to the result of the previous two transmutations of the support, which means that [the result] is categorized as the PURE REALM of culmination.

2. The Pure Realm

It is called PURE because all impurities have eternally ended, there is no increase of impurity or propensities, and it is pure by nature, perfect, and bright. REALM has the meaning of “store” because in it are harbored boundless marvelous, great qualities. Alternately, it has the meaning of “cause” because it has the power to generate the mundane and supramundane benefits and joys of the five vehicles [i.e., all people].

The pure realm of the Dharma may be categorized as exclusively pure, but how can the classes of mind of the four [kinds of] knowledge be exclusively pure? They are included in the truth of the path and for that reason are categorized as exclusively pure.

That is, the qualities, as well as bodies, lands, etc., of Buddhas are born of pure seed natures, because the impure seeds have been eternally rejected. Even though there is manifesting and creation of samsaric bodies and actions and passions, which appear to be the truths of suffering and cause, nevertheless, in reality, these are included in the pure truth of the path. The *Abhidharma-samuccaya* and other works say that fifteen sense fields, etc., are exclusively impure. Can it be that the Tathāgata [whose consciousness is pure] is devoid of the five organs, five [corresponding] consciousnesses, and five sense fields? There is an interpretation [by proponents of the Three Treatise School] that the qualities, bodies, and lands of a Tathāgata are profound and subtle, neither existing nor not existing, apart from all discrimination, severing all idle discourse, and not included among dharma categories such as sense bases, sense fields, etc. Therefore, there is no contradiction with the explanation [of the *Abhidharmasamuccaya*].

According to another interpretation, the five [sense] organs of a Tathāgata and the five [corresponding] objects are born from a profound *samādhi* and for that reason are categorized as form of the realm of the Dharma (*dharma-dhātu-rūpa*). Even though the five consciousnesses of non-Buddhas are based on this transformation [of a Tathāgata's consciousness], there is nevertheless a difference of coarse and subtle, and [the objects of that consciousness] are not categorized as the five objects [as ordinarily understood]. The five consciousnesses of a Tathāgata are not [included in] the sense bases of consciousness, because a scripture says that the five [sense] consciousnesses are by nature distracted [among non-Buddhas].

57b With what consciousness is knowledge of achieving the task associated? It is associated with the sixth [consciousness], because it generates the transformations [i.e., bodies] and their functions. Is there any difference between [this knowledge] and the nature of knowledge of wonderful observation? This [latter knowledge] contemplates the specific and common characteristics, etc., of various dharmas, while that [previous knowledge] only generates

transformation, so there is a difference. [It may be objected that] these two classes of knowledge must not occur together, because two consciousnesses of the same species do not occur together. There is no conflict with reason to admit that they do not occur together, for there is no error if they are the same in substance but function in different ways at the same time.

Alternately [this knowledge] is associated with the purified seventh consciousness. Having as objects such things as form, etc., in dependence on such organs as eyes, etc., is the special function of the knowledge of sameness. That is, when the pure seventh consciousness generates bodies for the enjoyment of others and images of lands, it is categorized as the class of [knowledge of] sameness; when it generates transformations, it is categorized as the class [of knowledge] of achieving the task.

Is this class [of knowledge] not acquired by the transmutation of the five [sense] consciousnesses? It is not that although acquired by that transmutation its substance is that [of the five consciousnesses], just as although it is said that one acquires *nirvāṇa* through the transmutation of *saṃsāra*, it cannot be said that *nirvāṇa* is included in *saṃsāra* in the same way. Therefore there should be no difficulty as far as this [present position] is concerned.

There is an interpretation [which is the correct one] that the qualities, bodies, and lands of a Tathāgata are included in the aggregates, sense bases, and sense fields as the case may be, but these three [categories of dharmas] may be impure or pure. When the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* and others say that fifteen sense fields, etc., are impure only, that is said with reference to coarse and superficial objects [and consciousness] of the two vehicles, but they do not mean all [objects and consciousness, as in a Buddha]. That is, of the eighteen sense fields attained by others [than a Buddha], only the last three are categorized as pure; although those attained by a Buddha are all pure, they are not included in objects known by the two vehicles.

Indeed, when other sources say that the Buddha's qualities, etc., are not sense fields, etc., it is because they are unlike the

characteristics of sense fields, etc., known through the inferior knowledge of the two vehicles. This must be the principle. Why? Because it is said that all conditioned dharmas are completely included in the aggregates, because all dharmas are categorized as sense bases and sense fields, and because a nineteenth sense field, etc., is rejected by the wise. If they are not sense fields, etc., because we end idle discourse, then we ought not to say that [the result of practice] is a “pure realm, good, eternal, blissful, the body of liberation,” etc.

Moreover, place after place says that one transmutes impermanent aggregates and acquires permanent aggregates. This must also be the case with sense bases and sense fields. Can we say that a Tathāgata is not aggregates, sense bases, and sense fields? Therefore when it is said that he is not, it is said with a hidden meaning. Also, when it is said that “the five [sense] consciousnesses are by nature distracted,” this refers to those attained by others, not those attained by a Buddha. Therefore, all eighteen sense fields, etc., are wholly contained in the body of a Buddha, but they are totally pure.

3. Inconceivable

This result of the transmutation of the support is also INCONCEIVABLE, because it transcends reflection and verbalization, because it is subtle and profound, is realized within oneself, and because the world can find no comparison for it.

4. Good

It is also GOOD, because it is by nature a good, “white” dharma, because the pure realm of the Dharma is removed from generation and extinction and is extremely tranquil, because the subtle functioning of the classes of mind of the four [kinds of] knowledge is incomparable and extremely skillful, and because both kinds [of result] have beneficial characteristics and oppose the nongood; hence it is said to be GOOD.

A treatise says that of the [twelve] sense bases, etc., eight are exclusively nondetermined [as to moral species]; but how can a

Tathāgata be devoid of the five [sense] organs and their three objects [of smells, tastes, and solid objects]? The three explanations concerning this should be made the same as before [in discussing sense fields]. 57c

All dharmas of a Tathāgata, such as bodies, lands, etc., are included in cessation and path [of the four noble truths]; therefore they are exclusively good, because the saints declare that cessation and path are by nature good only, because it is said that the lands, etc., of a Buddha are not [included in the truths of] suffering and cause. Characteristics of impurity, nongood, nondetermined, etc., as transformations of the Buddha's consciousness, all appear from seeds that are pure and good and are categorized as pure and good.

5. Eternal

This [result] is also ETERNAL, because it is endless. The pure realm of the Dharma is said to be ETERNAL because it is devoid of origination, devoid of cessation, and by nature unchanging. Because the support of classes of mind of the four knowledges is eternal, they are endless and therefore said to be eternal, but not that they are eternal by nature, because they originate from causes, because of the categorical declaration that that which is born ends with cessation, and because we do not see form or mind that is not impermanent. However, as a result of the power of original vows and the inexhaustible number of sentient beings to be converted, the four classes of knowledge last forever, uninterrupted and endless.

6. Blissful

It is also BLISSFUL, because it is devoid of torment. It is said to be BLISSFUL because the multitude of characteristics of the pure realm of the Dharma are tranquil. Because the classes of mind of the four knowledges are eternally separated from torment, they are called BLISSFUL. The natures of the two [results; i.e., *nirvāṇa* and *bodhi*] are wholly devoid of torment and are able to give bliss to all sentient beings, and therefore the two transmutations of the support are together referred to as BLISSFUL.

7. The Body of Liberation

The result of the two transmutations of the support of [followers of] the two vehicles is only freedom from the bondage of the obstacle of the passions and lacks admirable dharmas, and therefore it is only referred to as the BODY OF LIBERATION (*vimukti-kāya*).

8. The Dharma Body

The greatly awakened World-Honored One has attained supreme dharmas of silence, and for that reason he is named the GREAT MUNI [i.e., “Silent One”]. The two results acquired by this MUNI, the World-Honored One, are eternally separated from the two obstacles and are also named DHARMA-KĀYA [Dharma body, as well as Body of Liberation], because they are ornamented with dharmas that are great qualities, such as the innumerable, boundless powers, the four [kinds of] fearlessness (*vaiśāradya*), etc. Its meanings of substance, support, and accumulation are given the comprehensive name “body.” Therefore this Dharma body is by nature the five dharmas [of the realm of the Dharma and the four knowledges]. It is not the pure realm of the Dharma alone that is named “Dharma body,” because the results of the two transmutations of the support are wholly included in it.

This Dharma body is distinguished in three ways. The first is the essential body (*svābhāvika-kāya*), that is, it is the real, pure realm of the Dharma of all Tathāgatas, the unchanging support of the bodies of enjoyment and transformation (*saṃbhoga-kāya* and *nirmāṇa-kāya*), free of characteristics, tranquil, beyond all idle discourse, endowed with boundless real, eternal qualities, the unchanging true nature of all dharmas. Accordingly, the essential [body] is also called the “dharma body” because it is the support for dharmas that are great qualities.

The second is the body of enjoyment. This is of two kinds. The first is [the body] of personal enjoyment (*svasaṃbhoga-kāya*), that is, the boundless real qualities generated by the innumerable merits and knowledge accumulated by Tathāgatas over three

immeasurable eons, along with an extremely perfect, pure, eternal, omnipresent material body. It continues, placid, to the end of time, and always enjoys for itself the great joy of the Dharma.

The second is [the body] for the enjoyment of others. As a result of the knowledge of sameness, Tathāgatas manifest bodies of subtle, pure qualities and abide in a thoroughly pure land. For the hosts of bodhisattvas on the ten stages, they manifest great supernatural powers, turn the Wheel of the True Dharma, and rend the nets of the multitudes of doubts, causing [bodhisattvas] to enjoy the joy of the Mahayana Dharma. These two bodies together are called the “body of enjoyment.”

58a

The third [form of the Dharma body] is the transformation body. As a result of the knowledge of achieving the task, Tathāgatas manifest through transformation innumerable transformation bodies and dwell in pure and impure lands in accordance with the species [of being]. For hosts of bodhisattvas who have not yet entered the [ten] stages, [followers of] the two vehicles, and ordinary people, taking into account their capacities, they display supernatural powers, preach the Dharma, and cause each to secure things that are beneficial and pleasing.

As for the five dharmas [i.e., realm of the Dharma and the four knowledges] comprising the three bodies, there is an interpretation that the first two [i.e., the realm of the Dharma and the great mirror knowledge] comprise the essential body (*svābhāvika-kāya*), because the [*Buddhabhūmi*] *Sūtra* says that true suchness is the Dharma body. A treatise says that one acquires the essential body by transmuting the *ālaya* consciousness, and the class of perfect mirror knowledge transmutes the store consciousness so that [the essential body] is realized. The middle two knowledges [i.e., knowledge of sameness and knowledge of wonderful observation] comprise the body of enjoyment, because it is said that knowledge of sameness in a perfectly pure land manifests a body of a Buddha for bodhisattvas, and because it is said that in the great assemblies [of bodhisattvas], knowledge of wonderful observation preaches the Dharma, eliminates doubts, and displays mastery, and because

it is said that by transmuting the evolving consciousnesses, the body of enjoyment is acquired. The last class of knowledge comprises the transformation body, because it is said that in lands in the ten directions, knowledge of achieving the task manifests countless, unimaginable transformations. Also, the excellence of knowledge comprises the three bodies, and therefore we know that the three bodies are wholly made up of real knowledge.

According to another interpretation, the first [dharma of the five] comprises the essential body, because it is said that the essential body is essentially eternal, because it is said that the Dharma body of a Buddha is devoid of origination and cessation, and because it is said that it is acquired by means of causes for its realization but not by causes that produce it, and also because it is said that the Dharma body is possessed in common by all Buddhas, is omnipresent in all dharmas, like space, is devoid of characteristics, is unconditioned, and is neither form nor mind.

However, when it is said that it is acquired by the transmutation of store consciousness, it means that it is revealed when the coarseness of the two obstacles in the eighth consciousness is transmuted and destroyed. When it is said that the Dharma body comprises the excellence of knowledge, this is because that [body] is its support and real nature, and because even though the essential Dharma body is endowed with real, countless qualities, still it is unconditioned. One cannot say that it is such things as form, mind, etc.

The real qualities of the four knowledges and the eternal, omnipresent material body generated by mirror knowledge comprise [the body of] personal enjoyment. The Buddha body manifested by the knowledge of sameness comprises [the body of] enjoyment for others. The numerous characteristics of bodies manifested by knowledge of achieving the task in accordance with species comprise the transformation body.

It is said [in the *Mahāyāna Sūtrālamkāra*] that perfect mirror knowledge is the Buddha as [body of] enjoyment, because one acquires [the body of] enjoyment by transmuting the evolving consciousnesses. Even though it is also acquired by transmuting

the store consciousness, still [the *Mahāyāna Sūtrālaṃkāra*] says that the Dharma body is revealed by its transmutation and therefore does not mention acquiring [the body of] enjoyment in its abbreviated discussion.

It is also said that the Dharma body is devoid of generation and cessation, only acquired through causes for its realization, neither form nor mind, etc. The class of perfect mirror knowledge is opposed to this. If [that knowledge] is not affiliated with [the body of] enjoyment, to what body does it belong?

58b

Also, the body of enjoyment includes the special, conditioned, real qualities of the Buddha, and therefore the four classes of knowledge and really existing form and mind are wholly included in [the body of] enjoyment.

Also, [the body of] enjoyment for others and the transformation body are only revealed in order to convert others, and therefore it cannot be said that real knowledge is their substance. Even though it is said that the transformation body consists of the excellence of knowledge, nevertheless it [only] appears resembling knowledge or is generated by knowledge, and is [thus] metaphorically referred to as knowledge, but its substance is not really knowledge.

It is said only that the knowledge of sameness and achieving the task are able to manifest [respectively] the [body of] enjoyment [for others] and the transformation body with its three actions [of body, speech, and mind], but it is not said that these two bodies are the same as the two knowledges. Therefore these two knowledges are included in [the body of] personal enjoyment.

Indeed, even though the transformation body and [body of] enjoyment for others are devoid of real mind and mental activities, nevertheless there are minds and mental activities that are manifested through transformation. The spiritual powers of one who is supremely awakened are unimaginable, and therefore one is capable of revealing formless and substanceless dharmas through transformation. If this were not so, how could a Tathāgata manifest craving, hatred, etc., since he has eliminated them long ago? How could disciples and animals know the thoughts of a Tathāgata,

since the real thoughts of a Tathāgata are unknown even by bodhisattvas who are perfectly awakened?

Consequently, a scripture says that [a Tathāgata | creates innumerable species [of beings] and all are given minds. It is also said that a Tathāgata's knowledge of achieving the task creates the three actions [of body, speech, and mind]. It is also said that the transformation |created by the Tathāgata| has a mind that is dependent on others, because a seen part of consciousness appears that is dependent on another real mind. Even though it is said that transformations are devoid of organs, mind, etc., still this refers to [transformations by] others, not to [those of] Tathāgatas. Also, they are not said to have [organs, etc.] because the dharmas of material organs, mind, and mental functions of creations are devoid of the functioning of organs, etc.

Thus even though the three bodies are all endowed with boundless qualities, still each is different, that is, the essential body only possesses unconditioned qualities that are real, eternal, blissful, personal, pure, apart from all defilements; and they are the support of the good, without the difference of characteristics and functions of form, mind, etc. The body of personal enjoyment is endowed with countless kinds of real qualities, of subtle form and mind, etc. As for the [body of] enjoyment for others and the transformation body, they only possess limitless apparitional qualities that resemble form, mind, etc., along with the function of benefitting and gladdening others.

Also, the essential body is properly categorized as "for self-benefit," because it is peaceful, blissful, undisturbed, and inactive, but at the same time, it is the dominant condition for the benefitting of others, because it causes sentient beings to acquire benefit and gladness. It is also the support of [the body of] enjoyment and the transformation body and therefore includes both kinds of benefit [i.e., for oneself and for others]. The body of personal enjoyment has to do exclusively with self-benefit, while [the body of] enjoyment for others and the transformation body only have to do with the benefit of others, because they are revealed for others.

Also, the essential body is supported by the land of the Dharma nature (*dharmatā*). Even though there is no distinction between body and land as far as substance is concerned, nevertheless they are related to the Buddha and the Dharma [respectively], because nature and characteristics differ. Neither this Buddha nor this land is categorized as form, and even though it cannot be said that they are large or small, they are boundless, in accordance with the characteristics of their office, pervading all places like space.

The body of enjoyment is in effect its own land and is supported by it [in effect being the same]. That is, pure consciousness associated with perfect mirror knowledge, the maturation of causes for a pure, totally immaculate land resulting from [practices of] self-benefit cultivated in former times, transforms into a pure, totally immaculate land that continues from the first achievement of Buddhahood into the future, adorned with entirely perfect, limitless masses of jewels. The body of personal enjoyment is supported by it eternally and abides there. 58c

The dimensions of this body are the same as those of the pure land. Each of the [thirty-two] fundamental marks and [eighty] secondary marks [on the body] is limitless, because it originates from unlimited roots of good. Since the qualities and knowledge are not material dharmas, even though it can be said that they are large or small in size, nevertheless those [qualities] that are realized by the support [i.e., the body] and the body that supports them can be said to extend everywhere.

The body of enjoyment for others is also supported by its pure land. That is, knowledge of sameness, the maturation of causes for a pure, totally immaculate land by virtue of the power of great mercy and compassion and resulting from benefitting others cultivated in former times, transforms into a pure land in accordance with the dispositions of bodhisattvas on the ten stages, and it may be small or large, inferior or superior, and evolves over time. The body of enjoyment for others is supported by it and abides there. The size of the support and body are also indeterminate.

The transformation body is supported by a land of transformation. That is, knowledge of achieving the task, the maturation of causes for a pure, totally immaculate or defiled land by virtue of the power of great mercy and compassion and resulting from benefit to others cultivated in former times, transforms into a Buddha land in accordance with the needs of sentient beings who have not yet entered the [ten] stages, and it may be pure or defiled, small or large, and it evolves in time. The transformation body of the Buddha is supported by it and abides there. The size of the support and body are also indeterminate.

The essential body and its lands are realized identically by all Tathāgatas and therefore are in substance devoid of distinction. Even though the body of personal enjoyment and its supporting land are transformations of each Buddha and are not identical, nevertheless all are limitless, without obstructing each other. The remaining two bodies and lands may be common or uncommon to beings to be converted by various Tathāgatas. When they are common to those to be converted, various Buddhas each transform as a body and land at the same time and place. The shapes of bodies and lands resemble each other but do not obstruct each other. They develop in concert as the dominant condition that causes the being to be converted to manifest a transformation [body] from his own consciousness. That is, in one land there is a single Buddha body in order to manifest spiritual powers and preach the benefit of the Dharma for him. When [bodies, etc.] are uncommon, only one Buddha transforms a body in a land. It has been the nature of things from beginningless time that all sentient beings are related [to Buddhas] by disposition (*gotra*). Either many are related to one [Buddha] or one is related to many. Therefore there is common and uncommon relative to beings to be converted. Otherwise, there would be no benefit in many Buddhas abiding in the world for a long time in toilsome labor, because one Buddha could convert all beings.

These bodies and lands, pure and soiled, manifested from the transformation of a pure consciousness, are, like that transforming consciousness, both good and pure, because that which is born

of totally good, pure causes is included in the truth of the path, not in [the truths of] suffering and cause. The aggregates, etc., as images of consciousness, are not necessarily all identical, because the three dharms [i.e., aggregates, sense bases, and sense fields] are born of a mixture of causes. 59a

[Bodies and lands] manifested from the transformation of an impure consciousness are, like the transforming consciousness, all impure, because that which is born of an impure cause is included in [the truths of] suffering and cause, not in path or cessation.

The images of a consciousness that is good, etc., are not necessarily the same [i.e., good, etc.], because the three [moral] natures are born of a mixture of causes, and the identity or difference of aggregates, etc., should be similarly understood. Otherwise, there would be no five [aggregates], twelve [sense bases], etc.

Chapter XV

Conclusion

1. Consciousness Only

Indeed, [according to an interpretation] the seen part, etc., transforms and appears on the basis of consciousness and is not, like consciousness, a reality among the [nature that is] dependent on others. If this were not so, the principle of consciousness only would not be established, because it would be admitted that both consciousness and external objects really existed.

Alternately [according to another interpretation], the seen and seeing parts of consciousness are born from conditions, both originating in dependence on others and, like consciousness, may be false or real. The word “only” [in “consciousness only”] excludes the external but it does not deny internal objects. If this were not so, true suchness would also be unreal.

Since both internal objects and consciousness are not false, why do we just speak of “consciousness only” and not “objects [only]”? Consciousness only exists internally, while objects are also found externally [as well as internally]. We speak of “consciousness only” for fear of admitting the external [as being real].

Alternately [according to a third interpretation], the foolish deludedly grasp objects, generate passions and actions, and drown in [the ocean of] *saṃsāra*; they do not vigorously seek escape, becoming liberated by contemplating the mind; so out of sympathy and compassion for them we speak of “consciousness only” causing liberation from *saṃsāra* through one’s contemplation of the mind. We do not mean that internal objects are, like externals, totally unreal.

Alternately [according to a fourth interpretation], the seen part has consciousness as its nature. Through the power of perfuming, it is born resembling many parts. True suchness also is the real nature of consciousness, and therefore apart from the nature of consciousness there is no separately existing dharma. Here, the word “consciousness” also refers to mental activities, because mind and mental activities are undoubtedly associated.

The three parts of this treatise demonstrate consciousness only, and for that reason it is named the “Treatise Demonstrating Consciousness Only.” We also refer to this treatise by the name “Purification of Consciousness Only” because it reveals the extremely clear, pure principle of consciousness only.

The basic treatise [i.e., Vasubandhu’s Verses] is named “Consciousness Only in Thirty Verses” because in thirty verses the principle of consciousness only is revealed perfectly, with neither more nor fewer [verses].

2. The Transference of Merit

On the basis of holy teaching and correct reasoning,
The nature and characteristics of consciousness only
have been distinguished.

The merit we have secured is bestowed on all living beings,
And we vow that together we shall speedily
enter supreme *bodhi*.

**THE THIRTY VERSES ON
CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY**

by

Bodhisattva Vasubandhu

Translated into Chinese

by the Dharma Teacher of the Tripiṭaka,
Hsüan-tsang of the Great T'ang Dynasty

Translated from the Chinese

(Taishō Volume 32, Number 1586)

by

Francis H. Cook

Introduction to the Thirty Verses on Consciousness Only

The short verse work referred to commonly as the “Thirty Verses” is one of several important Buddhist treatises that propound the idea that nothing exists except consciousness or mind, or that all things believed by the ordinary person to be objective realities outside mind are in reality mere mental constructs. These treatises, along with several related scriptural works (*sūtra*), represent one of several important streams of Mahayana Buddhist teaching that include the doctrine of emptiness (*śūnyatā*), the doctrine of the matrix of Buddhahood (*tathāgata-garbha*), and the doctrine of the Buddha nature (*buddha-gotra*). Those who taught the doctrine of consciousness (*viññāna-vāda*), or practice of yoga (*yogācāra*), as it was also called, specialized in the theory of how the cognition of the true nature of things becomes distorted in humans through the processes of conceptualization, false imagination, and discrimination, and how the mind is restored to its innate purity and clarity, once more capable of seeing things as they truly are, undistorted by delusion and error.

One of the leaders in articulating this complex teaching was the great Indian Buddhist scholar-monk Vasubandhu, who is believed to have lived during the fourth century. To him is attributed a number of important treatises such as the “Thirty Verses,” as well as commentaries on scriptures. He is revered by all later Far Eastern schools of Buddhism for his authority, vast learning in Buddhist doctrine, and important contributions to the development of Buddhism.

The main point of the “Thirty Verses” is that the object of perception believed to be a real thing outside of the perceiving consciousness

does not really exist externally at all. It is said to be nothing but a mental construct (*viññapti*) projected by consciousness itself and therefore nothing but a transformation of consciousness. This much is clear from a reading of the "Thirty Verses." However, the main problem for the reader is that of determining in what precise sense it should be understood that the many sense data of everyday life are nothing but mental constructs. Interpreted in a radical manner, one arrives at philosophical idealism in which the teaching means literally that there is absolutely not in any sense anything external to the individual perceiving mind.

However, nothing as radical as this is called for, and the teaching of consciousness only is not a species of philosophical idealism. What Vasubandhu and other spokesmen for Buddhism are arguing is that the pure immediacy of any cognitive experience is distorted as soon as it occurs, through the superimposition of imaginary labels onto the experience. Thus the actual experience is interpreted by the mind, and this process reinforces the subsequent tendency to interpret in the same manner. The result is that the mind mistakes its stereotyped and habitual interpretations of events for the actual events. It is not that nothing exists in a world external to the mind but rather that the unenlightened individual is trapped in false consciousness and has no access to the real world outside the mind. The world experienced by the unenlightened is thus an exclusively mental, imaginary world filled with unrealities such as selves (*ātman*), others, Buddhas and ordinary beings, good and bad, and so on. Such a world is a world of discrimination, imagination, stereotyped reaction, and sedimented responses to experience, and consequently unreal.

The last few verses of the Treatise deal with the process of ending this chronic distortion of experience. Vasubandhu speaks metaphorically of a "transmutation of the support" (*āśraya-parāvṛtti*), which refers to a crucial change in the nature and function of ordinary consciousness and personality. It ends delusion and error and precipitates a pristine, nondeluded cognition of events, which is the awakened perception of a Buddha.

The work translated here is number 1586 in volume 31 of the *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*. The brief prose passages interspersed with the verses are the interpretive comments of the Chinese monk Hsüan-tsang, who translated the text from the Sanskrit. The verses are the same as those that serve as the basis for the extended commentary of the "Demonstration of Consciousness Only" printed elsewhere in this volume. In that work, however, the verses are given extensive comments by various Indian Buddhist scholars and manipulated in such a way that the verses evoke a very radical interpretation not found in the verses as translated here alone.

The text of the "Thirty Verses" exists in the original Sanskrit as well as the Chinese translation by Hsüan-tsang. The Sanskrit text has been translated and commented on extensively by Stefan Anacker, in *Seven Works of Vasubandhu*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984, and Thomas A. Kochumuttom, *A Buddhist Doctrine of Experience*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982.

The Thirty Verses on Consciousness Only

Bodhisattvas such as Dharmapāla created the demonstration of consciousness only (*viññapti-mātratā-siddhi*) in agreement with these thirty verses. Now, I will briefly show the reasons. In these thirty verses, the first twenty-four verses show the characteristics of consciousness only. The next verse shows the nature of consciousness only. The last five verses show active states of consciousness only. Of the first twenty-four verses, the first verse and a half explain the characteristics of consciousness only briefly. The next twenty-two and a half verses explain the characteristics of consciousness only extensively. That is, some outsider asks, “If there is only consciousness, why do ordinary people and holy teachings say that a self and dharmas exist?” The Verses reply,

The metaphor of self and dharmas
Evolves in various ways
Upon the transformation of consciousness.
The transforming consciousness is threefold: (1)

Retribution, thought,
And perception of the external realm. (2a,b)

The next twenty-two and a half verses extensively explain the characteristics of consciousness only, because the prior verses mentioned the three transforming consciousnesses briefly. Now, they extensively explain the characteristics of the three transforming consciousnesses. What are the characteristics of the first transforming consciousness? The Verses say,

First, the *ālaya* [store] consciousness is [also] retribution
and holder of all seeds. (2c,d)

That which it grasps and holds, its location, and its
perceptions are imperceptible.

It is always associated with mental contact,
Attention, feeling, conceptualization, and volition.
In it, the only feeling is one of indifference. (3)

It is undefiled and morally neutral,
And the same is true of mental contact, etc.
It always evolves like a flowing stream,
And is abandoned in the state of arhat. (4)

Having discussed the first transforming consciousness, what are
the characteristics of the second transforming consciousness? The
Verses say,

Next, the second transforming consciousness;
This consciousness is called *manas* (thought).
It evolves supported by that [store consciousness] and
with it as its object,
And has the nature and character of thinking. (5)

It is always associated with four passions:
Delusion about self, view of self,
Self-conceit, and love of self,
Along with others such as contact. (6)

It is defiled and morally neutral,
And bound to the place of birth.
In the arhat, the *samādhī* of cessation,
And the supramundane path, it does not exist. (7)

This is how the second transforming consciousness is explained.
What are the characteristics of the third transforming consciousness? The Verses say,

Next, the third transforming consciousness
With its sixfold distinction.

Its nature and character are that of perception of
the object,
And it is good, bad, or neither. (8)

They are associated with universal mental activities,
Those [mental activities] with specific objects, the good,
the passions,
Secondary passions, the nondetermined,
And all three feelings. (9)

First, the universal mental activities, [such as]
contact, etc.
Next, those with specific objects: that is, desire,
Resolve, memory, *samādhī*, and discernment [*prajñā*],
Whose objects are not the same. (10)

Faith, conscience, sense of shame,
The three roots [of good], [such as] noncraving, etc.,
Vigor, serenity, vigilance,
Indifference and harmlessness are the good
[mental activities]. (11)

The passions [*kleśa*] are craving, hatred,
Delusion, pride, doubt, and wrong views.
The secondary passions [*upakleśa*] are anger,
Hostility, dissimulation, vexation, envy, avarice, (12)

Deceit, hypocrisy, with harmfulness and vanity,
Lack of conscience and shamelessness,
Agitation and torpor,
Unbelief and indolence, (13)

Negligence and forgetfulness,
Distraction and incorrect knowing.
The nondetermined [states] mean remorse and sloth,
Applied thought and sustained thought, two pairs
in two ways. (14)

Having discussed mental activities associated with the six kinds of consciousness, how should one understand their states of appearance? The Verses say,

Supported on the fundamental consciousness,
The [first] five consciousnesses appear according
to conditions,
Either together or not,
Like waves supported by water. (15)

Mental consciousness [the sixth consciousness]
perpetually appears,
Except in those born among the unconscious celestials
And in the two mindless *samādhis*,
And in those who are [in states of] sloth and
stupefaction. (16)

We have extensively distinguished the characteristics of the three transforming consciousnesses as supports for the two parts that are transformed from them. How should we understand that the metaphorical “self” and “dharma” that are transformations based on consciousness are not separate realities and as a consequence are all consciousness only? The Verses say,

The various consciousnesses transform
As imagination and the imagined.
As a result of this, all these are nonexistent.
Therefore, all are consciousness only. (17)

If there is nothing at all but consciousness and no external conditions at all, from what are the many imaginations born? The Verses say,

From the consciousness that is all seeds
Transformation [occurs] in such-and-such ways.
Due to the power of mutual influence,
That-and-that imagination is born. (18)

Even though internal consciousness exists, still, there are no external conditions, so what is the basis for the continuity of birth

and death [*samsāra*] among sentient beings? The Verses say,

The habit energy of various actions
Together with the habit energy of the two graspings,
When prior retribution is exhausted,
Subsequently produce other retribution. (19)

If there is only consciousness, why did the World-Honored One say in place after place in the scriptures that there are three natures [for each object]? You should understand that the three natures are also not separate from consciousness. Why? The Verses say,

Because of whatever imagination,
Such-and-such a thing is imagined.
This imagined nature [*parikalpita-svabhāva*]
Does not exist. (20)

The nature that is dependent on others
[*paratantra-svabhāva*]
Is discrimination born of conditions.
The perfected [nature, *pariniṣpanna-svabhāva*] is
the eternal privation
Of the former nature from that [dependent nature]. (21)

Therefore, this [perfected nature] and the dependent
on others
Are neither different nor nondifferent,
Like the nature of impermanence, etc.
One not perceived, the other is not perceived. (22)

If there are three natures, why did the World-Honored One teach that all dharmas are wholly natureless [*niḥsvabhāva*]? The Verses say,

On the basis of these three natures
The threefold naturelessness is established.
Therefore, the Buddha taught with a hidden intention
That all dharmas are natureless. (23)

The first is naturelessness of characteristics [*lakṣaṇa*];

The next is naturelessness of self-existence;
The last is the nature that results from the privation
of the former
Self and dharmas that are grasped. (24)

This is the ultimate truth of all dharmas
And is also the same as true suchness,
Because it is eternally so in its nature.
It is the true nature of consciousness only. (25)

With regard to the last five verses showing the active state of consciousness only, the Treatise [i.e. Thirty Verses] says, “Such are the characteristics and nature of consciousness only that have been demonstrated. Who awakens to it and enters, how, and by how many states?” Those who are endowed with the two dispositions [*gotra*] of the Mahayana [enter and awaken to it gradually, in five states. What is the meaning of the two dispositions of the Mahayana?]. The first is inherent disposition [*prakṛti-gotra*]. That is, causes [i.e. seeds] of pure dharmas existing naturally from beginningless time adhering to fundamental consciousness. The second is the disposition created by perfuming [*vāsanā*]. That is, that which is created by perfuming caused by hearing, etc., from hearing the Dharma that flows uniformly from the realm of the Dharma. One must possess these two dispositions of the Mahayana in order to awaken to and enter [consciousness only]. What are the five states? The first is the state of equipment [*saṃbhāra-avasthā*]. That is, cultivation of the aids to liberation [*mokṣa-bhāgiya*] of the Mahayana. Supported by the nature and characteristics of consciousness, they are able to deepen belief and understanding. What is the characteristic [of this state]? The Verses say,

As long as one does not generate consciousness
That seeks to abide in the nature of consciousness only,
One is still unable to destroy
The propensities of the twofold grasping. (26)

The second is the state of added effort [*prayoga-avasthā*]. That is, cultivation of the aids to [cognitive] penetration [*nirvedha-bhāgiya*] of the Mahayana. Abiding in the state of added effort enables one

to eliminate gradually the grasper and the grasped. What are its characteristics?

Setting the least thing before one,
Saying, it is of the nature of consciousness only,
One does not really abide in consciousness only,
Because there is something obtained. (27)

The third is the state of thorough understanding [*prativedha-avasthā*]. That is, the path of insight [*darśana-mārga*] dwelt upon by all bodhisattvas. Abiding in the state of thorough understanding is like the real thorough understanding [itself]. What are its characteristics?

Whenever, regarding the objective realm,
Knowledge is completely devoid of something obtained,
Then it dwells in consciousness only,
Because it is divorced from characteristics of the
twofold grasping. (28)

The fourth is the state of cultivation [*bhāvanā-avasthā*]. That is, the path of cultivation [*bhāvanā-mārga*] dwelt upon by all bodhisattvas. The state of cultivation is like really perceiving the noumenal reality and cultivating it over and over. What are its characteristics?

Devoid of anything obtained, inconceivable,
This is supermundane knowledge.
Because of abandoning the twofold coarseness,
One realizes the transmutation of the support
[*āśraya-parāvṛtti*]. (29)

The fifth is the state of culmination [*niṣṭhā-avasthā*]. That is, abiding in supreme, perfect *bodhi*. By escaping the obstacles, perfect and bright, it has the ability to change sentient beings forever. What are its characteristics?

It is the pure realm,
Inconceivable, good, eternal,
Blissful, and the body of liberation,
Which in the great *muni* is named Dharma [body]. (30)

**THE TREATISE IN TWENTY VERSES
ON CONSCIOUSNESS ONLY**

by

Bodhisattva Vasubandhu

Translated into Chinese

by the Dharma Teacher of the Tripiṭaka,

Hsüan-tsang of the Great T'ang Dynasty

Translated from the Chinese

(Taishō Volume 31, Number 1590)

by

Francis H. Cook

Introduction to the Treatise in Twenty Verses on Consciousness Only

The brief verse work translated here and known commonly as the “Twenty Verses” should be read along with its companion piece, the “Thirty Verses,” which appears previously in this volume. These two short verse treatises by the Indian Buddhist scholar-monk, Vasubandhu, who lived during the fourth century, set forth the philosophical position that characterizes the Yogācāra School. But whereas the “Thirty Verses” is devoted to systematically discussing kinds of consciousness, the theory of seeds stored in the store consciousness, the nature of delusion and enlightenment, the process of eliminating false imagination and discrimination, and other aspects of Yogācāra thought, the “Twenty Verses” is devoted to defending this teaching against possible counter-arguments by Buddhists and non-Buddhist opponents.

The “Twenty Verses” is a series of hypothetical objections by possible opponents with replies by Vasubandhu. The objections of opponents are philosophically realistic arguments. In all cases, the opponent takes the realistic, no-nonsense position that the things seen, heard, smelled, etc., are real things that exist in the world outside the mind. The opponent typically offers an argument as to why it cannot be possible for perceived objects to be merely mental constructs (*viññapti*) and nonexistent apart from consciousness, which is Vasubandhu’s position. Along with this, he offers reasoned arguments as to why perceived objects must necessarily really exist apart from consciousness. That is why he is a realist. Vasubandhu counters each argument, explaining why the realistic argument is faulty and, at

the same time, why objects of perception cannot rationally be considered to exist apart from consciousness.

Consequently, Vasubandhu's work is to respond to what may be seen as the main counter-arguments to the Yogācāra position. He responds to such arguments as the claim that if perceived events do not exist outside consciousness, we ought not to be held karmically responsible for our deeds, which do not really exist apart from mind. He responds also to the argument that since we all have diverse karmic histories, we ought not all to see the same things at the same time if these events are only mental fabrications. Commonality of experiences argues for their objective reality. Likewise, he counters the argument that if other beings are only mental constructs, either we cannot meaningfully speak of knowing another's mind or else the other really does exist outside of mind. In arguing against these and a number of other objections, Vasubandhu displays a powerful grasp of Buddhist doctrine and an impressive mastery of logical reasoning.

The "Twenty Verses" is no. 1590 in vol. 31 of the *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*. The text, translated from the Sanskrit by the Chinese monk Hsüan-tsang, consists of a series of verses interspersed with prose commentary, Vasubandhu's own commentary (*vṛtti*) on his verses. I have numbered the verses for the convenience of the reader because on several occasions the verse is commented on in pieces. I have thus labeled the four naturally occurring parts of a verse "a," "b," "c," and "d." The reader will also note that the "Twenty Verses" actually contains twenty-one verses, not twenty. The final verse is not part of the arguments but rather Vasubandhu's confession of inadequacy and his praise for Buddhas, who alone know all the fine points of the doctrine. Readers who compare this translation with those made from the Sanskrit will also notice discrepancies in the number and numbering of the Chinese and Sanskrit versions. Verse number one in the Chinese text is verse number two in the Sanskrit version, which has a different first verse. The Sanskrit text thus has twenty-two verses.

The Chinese text has been translated once before, by Clarence C. Hamilton, *Wei Shih Er Shih Lun or the Treatise in Twenty Stanzas on Representation Only*, New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1938,

reprinted by Kraus Reprint Corporation, New York, 1962. The Sanskrit text was translated and discussed by Stefan Anacker, *Seven Works of Vasubandhu*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984, and Thomas A. Kochumuttom, *A Buddhist Doctrine of Experience*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982. Hsüan-tsang's disciple, K'uei-chi, wrote an indispensable commentary on the "Twenty Verses," *Wei-shih erh shih lun shu chi*, *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*, vol. 43, no. 1834. Most writers on Buddhist teachings in general or Yogācāra thought in particular have discussed the doctrine of consciousness only to one degree of adequacy or another.

The Treatise in Twenty Verses on Consciousness Only

“The three realms are consciousness only” of the Mahayana is established through the scriptural expression, “the three realms are mind only.” “Mind,” “thought,” “consciousness,” and “perception” (*viññapti*) are different names. Here, “mind” and “thought” are lumped together with mental activities (*caitta*). “Only” excludes objects of perception (*artha*) that are external [to consciousness], not associates [of consciousness]. When internal consciousness is born, it appears resembling external objects of perception, [but] in the same way that one with diseased eyesight sees [nonexistent] hairs, flies, etc. Here there is not the slightest aspect of reality. Regarding this concept, there are some doubts. A verse says,

74b

If consciousness is without real objects of perception,
The restriction (*niyama*) of place and time,
The nonrestriction of mental continuity (*saṃtāna*),
And function would not be established. (1)

The Treatise asks, what does this mean? If you reject [the idea that] consciousness really has external *dharma*s such as form, and [that] consciousness of form, etc., arises conditioned by [external] form, etc., why does this consciousness arise in some places but not in all places? Why does consciousness [of form, etc.,] occur in one place at one time but not at all times? When there are many mental continuities in the same single place at one time, why is [consciousness of form] not born restricted according to [just] one consciousness, just as one with diseased eyesight sees hairs, flies,

etc., but this consciousness is not born in someone without the disease? Again, [asks the realist,] why are the [imaginary] hairs, etc., seen by those with eye disease lacking in the function of [real] hair, etc.? Food, drink, swords, cudgels, poison, medicines, clothes, etc., in a dream are devoid of the function of food, etc. The Gandharva city etc., is devoid of the function of a [real] city, etc., but the function of other things such as [real] hair is not nonexistent. If [dreams and waking] are really the same, without external objects of perception such as form, and there is only internal consciousness that is born resembling an external objective realm, the restriction (*niyati*) of place and time, nonrestriction of mental continuities, and the functioning of things would not be demonstrated.

[We reply,] they are not all not demonstrated. A verse says,

Time and place are restricted as in dreams.

The body is not restricted, just as [hungry] ghosts (*preta*)

All alike see pus rivers, etc.,

And just as in dreams loss [of semen] has a function. (2)

The Treatise says, the meaning of “as in dreams” is that it is like what is seen in dreams. That is, just as in a dream there are no real objects of perception and still in one place one can see a village, garden, men and women, etc., but not in all places, and at this place at a certain time one can see a village, garden, etc., but not at all times. Consequently, although there are no real objects of perception external to consciousness, restriction of time and place are not undemonstrable.

The Treatise says, “as ghosts” means “hungry ghosts” (*preta*). The rivers [they see] are filled with pus and are therefore called “pus rivers,” in the same way one speaks of a pot filled with ghee as a “ghee pot.” This means that just as through the maturation of the same actions (*karma*) the many bodies of hungry ghosts collect together [in the nether world] and all see the pus rivers, it is not that in this [situation] it is restricted so only one sees it. The word “etc.” means that they also may see excrement, etc., and sentient beings grasping swords and cudgels, defending and guarding food and not allowing [the hungry ghosts] to get food.

Consequently, even though there are no real objects of perception apart from consciousness, still the nonrestriction of many mental continuities is demonstrated.

Also, just as in a dream the objects of perception are devoid of reality, yet there is a function for such things as loss of semen, etc., as a result of this, although there are no real objects of perception apart from consciousness, still, the concept of a function that is false [in a waking state] is demonstrated. Thus by using different similes, the four concepts such as restriction of place are demonstrated. Again, the next verse says,

All [four concepts] are like [beings in] hell
Who alike see infernal guardians, etc.,
And are made to be injured.
Therefore the four concepts are all demonstrated. (3)

The Treatise says, you should know that here, the single example of hell shows that restrictions of place, etc., are all demonstrated. The words “like hell” refer to various kinds of sentient beings who reside in hell and experience injury and suffering. That is, even though in hell there are no real sentient beings that include such things as infernal guardians, still, because of the dominant power of the maturation of identical acts of those sentient beings, many [individual] mental continuities (*samtāna*) in the same place, at the same time, all alike see infernal guardians, dogs, crows, iron mountains, etc., coming to them to inflict injury. As a result of this [example,] even though there are no real objects of perception apart from consciousness, still, the four concepts of restriction of place, etc., are demonstrated.

[The opponent asks,] why not admit that species such as infernal guardians are real sentient beings? [We respond,] because it does not correspond to reason. Now, these [guardians] should not be included with [beings in] *naraka* (hell), because they do not experience suffering in the way the others experience it, and if they [i.e., guardians and those being tormented] harm each other, then you cannot establish some as beings suffering in *naraka* and others as infernal guardians. Since all are alike in size, shape, and

power, they would not fear each other very much. They themselves [the infernal guardians] would not be able to bear the suffering of the constant burning of the fierce fires of iron earth, etc., so how would they be able to inflict injury on others? If they are not infernal beings, they ought not to be born there.

[Objection:] How do animals appear in the celestial realm? It is the same with *naraka*. Animals, ghosts, etc., act as infernal guardians, etc. [We reply,] this remedy [to your argument] is unsuitable. A verse says,

What is true of animals in the celestial realm
Is not true for those [beings in the] hells,
Because the animals and ghosts you assert
Do not experience that suffering. (4)

The Treatise says that with regard to animals being born in the celestial realm, they must have [past] karma that enables them to experience the happiness of that world (*bhājana*), and being born in that world, they definitely experience the happiness born of that world. The infernal guardians, etc., do not experience the suffering in hell that is born of that world. Therefore we should not admit that those with the destinations (*gati*) of animals or ghosts are born in *naraka*.

[Objection:] If that is so, then you must admit that the dominant (*adhipati*) power of karma of [beings born in] *naraka* produces unusual great elements (*mahābhūta*) that give rise to special shapes that display different sizes and power and upon whom we bestow such names as “infernal guardian.” In order to generate fear in those [reborn in hell,] they have different functions such as changing and appearing in various ways and moving their hands and feet, etc., like mountains that look like rams suddenly coming together [butting horns] and separating, or like thorns in the iron forest drooping down or lifting up [to impale the unfortunate sufferer].

[We reply,] it is not that these events are totally nonexistent; however, [your argument] does not correspond to reason. A verse says,

If you admit that as a result of the power of action
 Unusual great elements are born
 And they produce such changes,
 Why not admit [that they occur] in consciousness? (5)

The Treatise asks, why do you not admit that consciousness, as a result of the power of action (*karma*), transforms like this, yet assert great elements? Again, the next verse says,

Perfuming (*vāsanā*) of action is in one place,
 And you assert that the result exists elsewhere.
 That the result exists in the perfumed consciousness
 You do not admit; why is that? (6)

The Treatise says, you assert that [beings in] *naraka* produce special great elements born of the power of their own action and give rise to changes of shapes, etc. The perfuming of their action must logically be admitted as being in their [individual] continuities of consciousness (*viññāna-saṃtāna*) and nowhere else. There is a perfumed consciousness, but then you will not admit that there is a transformation of the result. Where there is no perfumed place, you turn around and assert that the result exists. Why is this?

[The opponent replies,] scripture is the reason. That is, if there is only consciousness that appears resembling form, etc., where there is no form, etc., the Buddha would not have spoken of the sense bases (*āyatana*) of form, etc. [We reply,] this teaching is no reason [for your position,] because it has a special meaning. A verse says,

For those beings to be instructed (*vineya*),
 The World-Honored One, with a hidden motive,
 Spoke of the existence of the sense bases (*āyatana*)
 of form, etc.
 In the same way [he spoke of] beings born
 spontaneously (*upapāduka*). (7)

The Treatise says, this is just like the Buddha speaking of the existence of sentient beings who are born spontaneously. It was said only with a hidden motive regarding the noncessation of

mental continuity and its ability to continue on into a subsequent time. He did not say that there are really existent beings who are born spontaneously, because he said, "There are no sentient beings or selves, only dharmas and their causes." It is the same when the scriptures speak of the sense bases of form, etc. [The Buddha spoke with a hidden motive of there being no separate real existence [of sense bases] for those beings to be instructed who are fit to receive that teaching.

[The opponent asks,] what is the hidden motive for speaking of the ten [bases] of form, etc.? [We reply,] a verse says,

Consciousness is born from its own seeds
And transforms to resemble characteristics of objects
of perception.
In order to establish internal and external sense bases,
The Buddha spoke of them as being ten. (8)

The Treatise asks, what does this mean? [Answer:] Consciousness appearing resembling form is born from its own seeds as a special transformation [of the mental continuity] and the confluence of conditions [consisting of the apparent form and the perceiving aspect of consciousness]. On the basis of this seed and the appearing form, the Buddha spoke of [the seed and the appearing form as] sense bases consisting of eyes and sense bases consisting of form, respectively. In this way, finally, [after skipping over sense bases of sound, smells, and tastes, we come to where] consciousness resembling something tangible is born from its own seeds as a special transformation [of the mental continuity] and the confluence of conditions [consisting of the apparent tangible object and the perceiving aspect of consciousness]. On the basis of this seed and the appearing tangible object, the Buddha spoke of them respectively as the sense base consisting of the body and the sense base consisting of tangible objects. With this hidden motive, he spoke of the ten [sense bases] of form, etc.

[Question:] What is the special value of this hidden motive?

[Reply:] A verse says,

On the basis of this teaching one can enter
The [teaching of the] absence of self (*anātman*) of the
person (*pudgala*).

Later, through other teachings, one enters
The [teaching of the] absence of self of the dharmas
that are asserted. (9)

The Treatise says, on the basis of this teaching of the twelve sense bases that are discussed, one who receives instruction is able to enter [and grasp] the absence of a self in the *pudgala* (person). That is, if one thoroughly understands that the six consciousnesses [i.e., the five sense consciousnesses of sight, etc., plus mental consciousness] develop from the six pair of dharmas [i.e., the twelve sense bases] and that there is no perceiver or knower at all, then that person who should receive the teaching of the absence of self in the sentient will be able to awaken to and enter the [teaching of the] absence of self in the sentient.

“Later, through other teachings,” means the teaching of consciousness only. The one who receives instruction is able to enter the absence of a self in the asserted dharmas. That is, if one thoroughly understands the arising of dharmas that resemble form, etc., as the appearance of consciousness only, and that among these there are not any dharmas with characteristics such as form, the person who should receive the teaching of the absence of a self in dharmas will be able to awaken to and enter [the teaching of] the absence of a self in all dharmas.

[Question:] If one understands the nonexistence of the entirety (*sarvathā*) of dharmas and enters the absence of a self in all dharmas, then consciousness only is [also, by implication,] ultimately non-existent, so how can it be established?

[Reply:] It is not by means of realizing the nonexistence of the entirety of dharmas that we speak of entering the absence of self of [all] dharmas. However, when the absence of self of the dharmas of self-nature (*svabhāva*) and difference (*viśeṣa*) that are imagined by the ignorant are penetrated in this way, then it is referred to as “entering the absence of self of dharmas.” It is not called “absence

of a self of dharmas” because the Dharma nature (*dharmatā*) apart from words that is the object of perception of Buddhas does not exist at all. [Rather,] one speaks of the absence of a self in dharmas because what is grasped by another consciousness [other than that of a Buddha] is of the nature of consciousness only and its substance is also nonexistent.

Otherwise, objects of perception grasped by other consciousnesses would [really] exist and the principle of consciousness only would not be demonstrated, because it is admitted that other consciousnesses have real objects of perception. As a consequence of this reasoning, we speak of establishing the teaching of consciousness only, universally causing one to awaken to and enter [the teaching of] the absence of self of all dharmas, and not because the entirety [of dharmas] are rejected as having a nature [of any kind].

[Question:] Again, how do we know that the Buddha, on the basis of a hidden motive, said that there are sense bases of form, etc.? Are there no really existing external dharmas such as form, each of which becomes the special object of perception of consciousness of form, etc.?

[Answer:] A verse says,

That object of perception is not one thing,
Nor is it many atoms.
Also, it is not a compound, etc.,
Because atoms are not demonstrated [as real]. (10)

The Treatise asks, what is being said? It means that if there are really existing sense bases such as external form, and each [sense base] acts separately as an object of perception for consciousness of form, etc., then such an external object of perception is either a single thing, as in the Vaiśeṣika assertion of a [single] form with parts, or else it must be many [atoms], such as the assertion of really existing multiple atoms, each of which serves as a separate object of perception.

Or the object of perception must be a compound or combination of atoms, like the assertion of really existing multiple atoms all unit-

ing and combining to make objects of perception. But that external object of perception must not logically be one thing, because a substance of form possessing parts that is different from the parts cannot be grasped. It also cannot logically be many [atoms], because the atoms cannot be grasped individually. Nor, logically, does a compound or combination act as an object of perception, because the principle of a single ultimate atom (*paramāṇu*) is not demonstrated [as existing]. Why is it not demonstrated? A verse says,

If an atom is united with six [other atoms],
The one must consist of six parts.
If it is in the same place with the six,
Then the combination must be like [a single] atom. (11)

The Treatise says, if each of six sides of an atom is united with [another] atom, [the single atom] must be made up of six parts, because it is not possible for the location of one [atom] to be in the locations of the others. If there are six atoms in the location of one atom, then the combined form must resemble the mass of [a single] atom, because, being interchangeable, they do not exceed the mass [of a single atom,] in which case the combined form would be invisible.

The Kashmiri Vaibhāṣika masters say, "We do not mean that atoms unite. [Atoms] have no parts, and therefore we avoid such [logical] faults as the one above. However, the combined forms possess the characteristics of union, because these [combinations] do have parts." [We reply,] this, too, is not correct. A verse says,

Since atoms do not unite,
To what does the union of [larger] combinations belong?
Or else, the uniting [of atoms] is not demonstrated;
It is not because they are devoid of parts. (12)

The Treatise says, we must now scrutinize this principle and its meaning. Since there is no separate combined form that differs from atoms, then if atoms do not combine, whose combined union is it? If you change [your position] and try to save it by saying that the development of combined form does not imply union, then you should not say that they do not combine because they are devoid

of parts, because a combination has parts, yet, you do not admit union. The nonunion of atoms is not a result of their being devoid of parts. Therefore, not a single ultimate atom (*paramāṇu*) is demonstrated. Also, the faults [in your reasoning] are still the same whether you admit that atoms unite or do not unite. Whether you admit that atoms have parts or do not have parts, both [positions] are big errors. Why? A verse says,

If an atom has parts,
It logically would not form a unity.
Without [parts], there would be no shadow
or concealment,
And a combination not being different [from
atoms,] it is devoid of the two. (13)

The Treatise says, the six parts [i.e., sides] of an atom being different, many parts make up its body, so how can they form a unity? If an atom does not have different parts, then how is it that when the sun rises and its light illuminates it, the other side is able to reveal shadow? Since there are no other parts unreached by the light and you are asserting atoms without parts, how can this [atom] and that [atom] successively conceal each other [from view]? And since there are no remaining parts unreached by the other, how can you say that this and that [atoms] successively conceal each other? Since they do not conceal each other, the various atoms must be interchangeable in the same place, and then the combined forms must have the same mass as a single atom. The error is the same as previously mentioned.

[Question:] Why not admit that shadow and concealment belong to combinations but not to atoms? [We reply,] can it be that you admit that there is combined form that differs from atoms that casts shadows and acts to conceal [another form]? [The questioner says,] not at all. [We reply,] in that case, the combination must be devoid of the two [i.e., shadow and concealment]. That is, if combined form is not different from atoms, then shadow and concealment must be demonstrated as not belonging to combined form. Arranging

and distinguishing, you establish [form] as atoms or you establish it as a combination [of form, but] both are unrealities.

[Question:] What is the use of choosing atoms or combination as it? You are still unable to refute the characteristics of external form, etc. [We reply,] what, again, are these characteristics? [The objector replies,] objects of perception of eyes, etc., are of the nature of being real colors such as blue, etc. [We reply,] we must ascertain together whether the true nature of blue, etc., of objects of perception of the eyes, etc., are unitary or many. [The opponent says,] suppose [either] is so; what is the problem? [We reply,] both [arguments] are faulty. The fault of there being many is as [explained] previously. The [position] of unitariness is also unreasonable. A verse says,

In the case of unity, there would be no piecemeal going;
 One could arrive and not yet arrive at all times.
 [Nor] would there be intervals between many [things],
 [Or] tiny things that are difficult to see. (14)

The Treatise says that if there were blue, etc., that was without divisions, objects of perception reached by the eyes, etc., would be grasped as single things. There would be no principle of gradually travelling the earth, because by setting down one foot, you would arrive at all [places]. What is more, at all times, one would be [both] here and there, without arriving [here] or not arriving [there], because a single thing or single time [without divisions] would logically neither be grasped nor not grasped.

Also, there could not be disconnected things such as many elephants, horses, etc. in a single location. If one place had one, it would have the others. How would one or another be distinguishable? Or else, if there were two [of something,] how would it be possible for them to reach or not reach [a place] or for one to see an empty space between them? Also, there would be no tiny things that are difficult to see, such as small water insects, because being in the same location as something gross, their mass would be equal [and no small object would appear]. If you say that this or that

[object] has differences due to its characteristics and becomes a different thing for no other reason, then you certainly must admit that these [large] distinct things differentiate repeatedly, forming multiple atoms, and since we have argued that an atom is not a single real thing, then eyes, etc., and form, etc., apart from consciousness as organs of perception or as objects of perception, are incapable of being demonstrated. As a result of this, we have easily demonstrated the principle that only consciousness exists.

[Question:] Dharmas are determined to exist or not exist through the use of accepted means of knowledge (*pramāṇa*), and the most excellent of all accepted means of knowledge is direct perception (*pratyakṣa*). If there are no external objects of perception, how can one have the awareness, “I am now experiencing such an object of perception?” [We reply:] This proof is not demonstrated. A verse says,

Direct awareness is as in dreams, etc.
At the time direct awareness has occurred,
The seeing and the object of perception are already
nonexistent.

How can you admit the existence of direct perception? (15)

The Treatise says, just as, even though when we dream, etc., there is no external object of perception, still, such direct awareness as this is possible, so, also, direct awareness at other times must be understood to be likewise. Therefore, their citation of this [example] as proof is not demonstrated.

Also, if, at that time, there is the direct awareness, “I am now directly experiencing such a form,” etc., one can see at that time, vis-à-vis the object of perception that it is already nonexistent, because it is necessarily in the mental consciousness (*manovijñāna*) that one can distinguish [visible forms], and because by that time [when awareness dawns in mental consciousness], visual and other kinds of consciousness have necessarily already ceased. Those who theorize about instantaneousness (*kṣaṇavādin*) say that when this awareness [in mental consciousness] exists, the actual object of

perception such as form has already ceased. How can you admit that at this time there is direct perception?

[The objector replies,] it is necessary that something that mental consciousness is able to remember has already been directly experienced [in the immediately antecedent mental moment], and for that reason, it is certain that there is an object of perception that has been experienced. He who sees this object of perception admits that it is direct perception. From this, the principle of an external object of perception that really exists is demonstrated.

[We reply,] the principle that one perceives that there is an external object because it is necessary that there first be an experience and then a memory is not demonstrated. Why? A verse says,

As we have said, there is consciousness that resembles
an external object of perception,
And from this is born a memory. (16a,b)

The Treatise says, as we have said previously, even though there are no external objects of perception, still, visual consciousness (*cakṣur-vijñāna*), etc., appears resembling an external object of perception. Following this, at a subsequent stage, [the object of perception] is associated with memory, and discriminating mental consciousness appears resembling the prior object of perception. Then we speak of this [process] as remembering what has already been experienced. Therefore, using a subsequent memory to prove the real existence of an external object of perception that was previously seen is not demonstrated.

[Counter-argument:] If it is just as in an awakened state as in a dream that even without real objects of perception, consciousness is still able to occur, then, just as ordinary people know that dream objects of perception are nonexistent, why, when they are awake, and it is so [that external objects are not real], do they not naturally know [they are unreal]? Since they do not naturally know that waking objects are nonexistent, how, as in dream consciousness, are real objects of perception all nonexistent? [Answer:] Neither is this demonstrated. A verse says,

When not awake, one cannot know
That what is seen in a dream does not exist. (16c,d)

The Treatise says, just as one in a not-yet-awakened state does not know that objects of perception in a dream do not really exist externally, but once awakened one knows it, in the same way, [conscious] worldly false discrimination is repeatedly confused as in a dream. None of the entities one sees really exists, and one who has not acquired true awakening cannot know this. If one acquires that supramundane antidote [to delusion] that is nondiscriminative knowledge (*nirvikalpaka-jñāna*) called “true awakening,” then the mundane pure knowledge acquired subsequent to this (*tat-prṣṭhalabha-śuddha-laukika-jñāna*) appears before one and one knows thoroughly according to reality that that object of perception is not real. The principle is the same [in both dreams and the waking state].

[Objection:] If in sentient beings there arises consciousness that resembles [external] objects of perception because of a special transformation of their own mental continuity (*saṃtāna*) and not because of external objects of perception born from conditions, how can it be demonstrated that these sentient beings are approached by good or bad companions, hear the correct or wrong teaching, and have [one of] two [kinds of] consciousness determined, since there are [in reality] no companions or teachings [outside of consciousness]?

[We reply,] we are not incapable of demonstrating it. A verse says,

By means of the interchange of dominant power,
Two [individual] consciousnesses achieve restriction
(*niyama*). (17a,b)

The Treatise says, by means of the dominant condition (*adhipati-pratyaya*), which is the interchange between various [individual] consciousnesses, which are the mental continuities of sentient beings, two [kinds of] consciousness are restricted as is fitting [to each individual]. That is, because the difference in consciousness in the

mental continuity of one causes differences in the mental continuity of another consciousness to occur, each becomes restricted [according to kind], but not as a result of external objects of perception.

[Question:] If, just as in a dream, objects of perception are devoid of reality but consciousness can occur, and the same is true of waking consciousness, what is the reason for good or bad action taking place in a dream or in a waking state not receiving the same results of action (*karma-phala*), either desirable or undesirable?

[We reply,] a verse says,

The mind is weakened by sleep,
So the results [of acts] in sleep and wakefulness are
not the same. (17c,d)

The Treatise says, in dreams the mind is weakened by sleep and its power is slight. This is not true of the awake mind. Therefore acts performed ought to receive different retribution (*vipāka*), and so weak and strong are not the same. [The reason] is not because of external objects of perception.

[Question:] If there is only consciousness and no body, speech, etc., how are sheep, etc., killed? If the deaths of sheep are not the result of someone's injury, how can the one who is a butcher commit the crime of killing beings?

[We reply,] a verse says,

As a result of the transformation of another's
consciousness,
There are acts of injury and killing,
Just as the mental power of anger of sage-immortals
(*āraṇyaka*),
Causes others to lose their memory, etc. (18)

The Treatise says, just as the mental power of a demon, etc., causes other sentient beings to lose their memory, have dreams, or bring about such strange events as possession by evil spirits; or the mental power of someone who possesses supernatural powers causes another person to see many things in a dream, just as

Mahākatyāyana's power of wish caused King Sāraṇa, etc., to see strange things in a dream; and also just as the mental powers of anger of sage-immortals caused King Vemacitra to see strange things in a dream; in the same way, the transformation of consciousness of one individual brings about events that cause injury to the life force of another person far away. You should realize that "death" refers to the severing of the personal mental continuity through changes of consciousness. Again, a verse says,

The emptiness of the Daṇḍaka [Forest], etc. —
How could it result from the anger of sage-immortals?
Mental harm is a great offense;
How, again, can this be demonstrated? (19)

The Treatise says, if you do not admit that other sentient beings die as a result of the dominant power of transformation of the consciousness of another, how is it that the World-Honored One, in order to prove that mental harm is a great offense, asked Upāli the householder, "Have you ever heard why the Daṇḍaka Forest, Mātāṅga Forest, and Kalinga Forest were all made empty and solitary?"

The householder answered the Buddha, saying, "Gotama, I have heard that it was because of the mental anger of sage-immortals (*āraṇyaka*)." If you assert that spirits or demons, respecting the sage-immortals and knowing their hatred [for the king], acted to kill the species of sentient beings, and it was not a result of mental anger [on the part of the sage-immortals], then why [did the Buddha] introduce that [story] to establish mental harm as having the nature of a major offense and surpassing physical and verbal [offenses]? Consequently, you must realize that it is well demonstrated that the death of sentient beings [in the story] resulted only from the anger of the sage-immortals.

[Question:] If only consciousness exists, does knowledge of the minds of others [really] know the minds of others or not? [We reply,] if we agree, what is the error? [The opponent argues,] if you are unable to know, how can you speak of knowledge of others' minds? If you are able to know [the minds of others,] then

consciousness only is not demonstrated [because you admit the real existence of others]. [We reply,] even though one knows the minds of others, still, it is not [knowing] according to reality (*yathā-artha*). A verse says,

How does knowledge of others' minds
Not know the object of perception according to reality?
In the same way that knowledge in knowing one's
own mind
Does not know it in accordance with the object of
perception of a Buddha. (20)

The Treatise says, how can knowledge of the minds of others not know objects of perception in accordance with reality? It is like knowledge of one's own mind. [Question:] Why does knowledge of one's own mind not know the object of perception according to reality? Because of ignorance of the object of perception. Because each of the two [kinds of knowledge] is concealed by ignorance, they do not know the ineffable object of perception in accordance with a Buddha's pure knowledge. These two do not know the object of perception in accordance with reality because of false appearances that resemble external objects of perception, and because the discrimination of the grasped and the grasper is not eliminated. The principles and [numbers of] meanings of [the teaching of] consciousness only are boundless in the differences of ascertainties and kinds, and their depths are difficult to cross over. If one is not a Buddha, who can ascertain their total extent? A verse says,

According to my ability, I
Have briefly demonstrated the principles of
consciousness only.
Of these, the entirety (*sarvathā*)
Is difficult to consider and is reached [only] by
Buddhas. (21)

The Treatise says, the kinds of principles and meanings of |the teaching of| consciousness only are limitless. I have briefly demonstrated them according to my own ability. The rest of the entirety have not been considered [by me|because they transcend the realm reached by my investigation. Such principles and meanings are only reached [in their entirety|by Buddhas, because Buddhas, the World-Honored Ones, are unobstructed with regard to objects of perception and knowledge of the entirety.

Glossary

absence of self (*anātman*): The Buddhist teaching that persons neither possess nor are composed of any permanent self, person, soul, or substance of any kind. Belief in a self is a delusion and the basis of all suffering. *See also* self.

acquisition (*prāpti*): A force possessed by humans that allows the residue remaining from karmic deeds to adhere to a stream of consciousness (q.v.) even though there is no self or being that could possess the residue.

action (*karma*): Karma consists of vocal or physical acts that are preceded by intention or will and that always have consequences, fruit (*phala*).

aggregates (*skandha*): Buddhism usually talks about the five aggregates which are the five mental and physical factors that make up the nominal person: (1) form, (2) feeling, (3) conceptualization, (4) volition (or karmic predisposition), and (5) consciousness (q.v.). What we call a “person” or “being” is just these five factors, without a sixth that might be a self (q.v.), person, soul, being, etc.

aggregates that are grasped (*upādāna-skandha*): The aggregates as objects of clinging.

ālaya. *See* fundamental consciousness; store consciousness.

arhat: Someone who has attained the ultimate state of spiritual perfection in Theravada (or Hinayana) Buddhism. The Buddha was an arhat but also a perfectly enlightened one, which is two degrees higher. (In between is the *pratyekabuddha* [q.v.].) An arhat will not be reborn after death, and in this life he is without any defilements.

attainment of cessation (*nirodha-samāpatti*): A meditative trance state marked by the absence of normal thought and perception. *See also* cessation of thought and feeling.

being without hope of *nirvāṇa* (*agotraka*): A being born without the capacity for enlightenment. They do not belong to the class (*gotra*) of people who have such a capacity, according to the text. This doctrine was rejected by most Mahayana Buddhists.

blazing discernment (*arciṣmatī*): The fourth of the ten [bodhisattva] stages (q.v.).

bodhi (“awakening”): Enlightenment; a state in which one is awakened to the true nature of things (q.v.), or true suchness (q.v.).

bodhisattva: A being who has vowed to achieve Buddhahood someday and who actively engages in the spiritual practices of Mahayana Buddhism to achieve that goal. The chief characteristics of the bodhisattva are boundless compassion for all living beings and clarity of comprehension.

body for the enjoyment of others (*paraśaṃbhoga-kāya*): The glorified body of a Buddha adorned with the thirty-two major marks and eighty minor marks, resulting from eons of spiritual practices. Advanced bodhisattvas can perceive this body, hence, “for the enjoyment of others.”

body of personal enjoyment (*svaśaṃbhoga-kāya*): The glorified body of a Buddha, adorned with the thirty-two major marks and eighty minor marks, resulting from eons of spiritual practice. Only a Buddha enjoys this body; it is not known to others.

bond (*pariyavasthāna*): A spiritual bond, such as ignorance.

Buddha: One who has awakened from delusion, craving, and hatred. An enlightened one who knows the true nature of things (q.v.) or true suchness (q.v.). The highest state of human perfection.

Buddha nature (*buddha-gotra*): The basic enlightened nature of sentient beings, which is chronically obscured by their ignorance. The complete unfolding of the Buddha nature is enlightenment itself.

cause of suffering (*samudaya*): The second of the four noble truths (q.v.).

cessation of thought and feeling (*saṃjñā-veditā-nirodha*): An advanced state of meditation marked by the cessation of thought processes and of feelings of pleasure, pain, etc.

cessation resulting from discrimination (*pratisaṃkhyā-nirodha*): A state of profound meditative trance resulting from conscious efforts of discrimination.

cessation resulting from the absence of conditions (*apratisaṃkhyā-nirodha*): A state of profound meditative trance that occurs in the absence of conditions giving rise to ordinary states of mind.

class (*gotra*): In this text, beings are classified according to whether or not they have the capacity for enlightenment. *See also* being without hope of *nirvāṇa*.

cloud of the Dharma (*dharma-meghā*): The tenth of the ten (bodhisattva) stages, in which the bodhisattva preaches the Dharma. *See also* ten (bodhisattva) stages.

compassion. *See* immeasurable.

conceptualization (*saṃjñā*). *See* aggregates.

condition as (or in the form of) perceptual object. *See* four conditions.

conditioned dharma (*saṃskṛta-dharma*): A physical or mental element (such as mind, visual organs, hatred, etc.) that is produced from the confluence of several conditions. It is contrasted with unconditioned dharmas, such as space and *nirvāṇa*.

consciousness (*viññāna*): One of the five aggregates (q.v.). In the system of the present text, consciousness is divided into eight parts or functions, namely, the first five sense consciousnesses (visual consciousness, etc.), mental consciousness (q.v.), thought (q.v.), and the store consciousness (q.v.) that is “perfumed” by karma and that stores the seeds of future action.

consciousness as retribution (*vipāka-viññāna*): Consciousness that originates as the result of previous karma. Consciousness as the maturation of seeds of new delusion.

consciousness only (*viññapti-mātra*): The central teaching of the present text and the school of Buddhism that arose based on it, that nothing exists but consciousness (q.v.) or mental constructs (*viññapti*).

conventional truth (*saṃvṛti-satya*): Our experience is not real in the light of the ultimate truth (q.v.). But it is real conventionally as far as our nonreflective common sense sees it.

cultivation of mind (*bhāvanā*): A synonym for meditation. *Bhāvanā* is the repetitive contemplation of some insight or truth that one has discovered.

delight in the success of others. *See* immeasurable.

destination (*gati*): A realm where one is reborn. Buddhism recognizes five or six, i.e., the human world, the world of animals, the world of gods, (sometimes) the world of titans, the world of hungry ghosts, and hell.

dharaṇi. *See* Translator’s Introduction, p. 5.

dharma/Dharma. *See* Translator’s Introduction, p. 5.

Diamond-like *Samādhi* (*vajropama-samādhi*): A state of meditative trance that is unbreakable.

- difficult to vanquish (*sudurjaya*): The fifth of the ten [bodhisattva] stages (q.v.).
- direct perception (*pratyakṣa*): One of the means of acquiring knowledge, another being inference.
- discernment (*mati/prajñā*): Often translated as “wisdom.”
- disciple (*śrāvaka*): A disciple of the Buddha when he was living; or, a Hinayana practitioner.
- dominant condition (*adhipati-pratyaya*). *See* four conditions.
- eliminated by insight (*darśana-heya*): Passions (q.v.) that must be eliminated on the path of insight (q.v.). Other passions are to be eliminated by cultivation of mind (q.v.).
- emptiness (*sūnyatā*): The quality that all things have of being devoid of any independent, real existence. Emptiness is emptiness of self-nature (q.v.), which is independent being, autonomy, etc. The central and fundamental teaching of Mahayana Buddhism.
- emptiness of dharmas (*dharma-sūnyatā*): A dharma is a mental or physical factor, such as hatred or the eyes. They are considered empty because they are without independent existence. A dharma exists only in dependence on other dharmas and therefore merely has a contingent, quasi-reality. Dharmas are not really real. *See also* emptiness.
- emptiness of the person (*pudgala-sūnyatā*): The truth that our perception of an independent, real selfhood or personhood is unreal, arising out of other conditions such as memory, the ability to be self-aware, etc.
- enlightenment. *See* *bodhi*.
- essential body (*svābhāvika-kāya*). *See* three [Buddha] bodies.
- extreme joy (*pramuditā*): The first of the ten [bodhisattva] stages (q.v.).
- false imagination (*abhūta-parikalpa*): The habitual belief that things exist apart from consciousness and that their characteristics are real.
- falsely imagined nature. *See* three natures.
- far going (*duramgamā*): One of the ten [bodhisattva] stages (q.v.).
- feeling (*vedanā*): One of the aggregates (q.v.) that constitute the nominal person. The three feelings are pleasant, unpleasant, and neither pleasant nor unpleasant.
- formless realm (*ārūpya-dhātu*): The uppermost of the three consecutive vertical realms of Buddhist cosmology, where beings are without material form.

forms of birth (*yonī*): One may be reborn from a womb, from moisture, from an egg, or through spontaneous miraculous rebirth.

four conditions: (1) Condition as cause (*hetu-pratyaya*), the most important (there are six kinds; see the text); (2) condition as (or in the form of) perceptual object (*ālambana-pratyaya*), the mental image erroneously thought to be an external object serving as the source for consciousness of an object; (3) dominant condition (*adhipati-pratyaya*), which leads a condition as cause to exercise its efficacy; and (4) immediately antecedent condition (*samanantara-pratyaya*), whereby, in a constant state of momentariness, the instantaneous state of a thing causes its immediately subsequent state.

four noble truths: (1) All worldly life is suffering; (2) the cause of suffering is desire; (3) desire can be overcome; and (4) the way to overcome desire is the eightfold path (right view, right thought, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right vigor [or effort], right mindfulness, and right concentration).

fruit of retribution (*vipāka-phala*): One of five kinds of fruits or results of preceding conditions.

fundamental consciousness (*mūla-vijñāna*): Same as the *ālaya* or store consciousness (q.v.), i.e., the eighth consciousness, which stores the seeds of future karma, delusions, and enlightenment. It is so called because it is the latent source of karmic conditioning for the active consciousness. *See also* store consciousness.

fundamental passions (*mūla-kleśa*): The three fundamental passions are craving, hatred, and delusion. *See also* passions.

good discernment (*sādhumati*): One of the ten [bodhisattva] stages (q.v.).

grasped (*grāhya*): One of two basic aspects of consciousness (q.v.), the other being the grasper (q.v.). What appear to be really existing external objects are merely images within consciousness. One part of consciousness is the grasper, or perceiver, the other is the object, the grasped aspect of consciousness.

grasper (*grāhaka*): The active aspect of consciousness, which perceives seemingly real external objects. *See also* grasped.

great awakening (*mahā-bodhi*): The achievement of enlightenment and Buddhahood. *See also* *bodhi*.

great compassion (*mahā-karuṇā*): The compassion of bodhisattvas and Buddhas, which is boundless and impartial, in comparison with the compassion of ordinary people.

great transmutation (*vipula-parāvṛtti*): The perfect and extensive transmutation of store consciousness (q.v.).

heat (*uṣmagata*): One of the aids to cognitive penetration.

hungry ghost (*preta*): One of five or six destinations (q.v.) into which one may be reborn.

ignorance (*avidyā*): The primary root of all evil and suffering.

immaculate consciousness (*amala-vijñāna*): The purified store consciousness (q.v.).

immaculateness (*vimalā*): One of the ten [bodhisattva] stages (q.v.).

immeasurable (*apramāṇa*): A form of meditation in which a quality such as friendliness (*maitrī*) is gradually extended from a few beings to encompass more and more beings, until none are excluded. The quality is thus immeasurable. There are four immeasurables: friendliness, compassion, delight in the success of others, and indifference (q.v.).

immediately antecedent condition. *See* four conditions.

indifference (*upekṣā*): One of the chief Buddhist virtues, that of renunciation, leading to a state of indifference without pleasure or pain, or independence of both; the fourth of the four immeasurables. *See also* immeasurable.

inferior transmutation (*hīna-parāvṛtti*): The inadequate change of consciousness achieved by non-Mahayana Buddhists. It is not incorrect, only incomplete.

intermediate existence (*antarā bhava*): The form of existence between death and rebirth.

karma. *See* Translator's Introduction, p. 5.

karmic predispositions (*saṃskāra*): One of the aggregates (q.v.). All forms of Buddhism have long lists of the *saṃskāras* which include such things as greed, faith, anger, agitation, pride, and so on.

learner (*śaikṣa*): The state of one who has not yet completed spiritual practices, the antonym of post-learner (q.v.).

light emissions (*prabhā-karī*): One of the ten [bodhisattva] stages (q.v.).

Limit of Reality (*bhūta-koṭi*): A synonym for emptiness (q.v.), ultimate reality, ultimate truth (q.v.), and the Dharma body. *See also* three [Buddha] bodies.

maintaining consciousness (*ādāna-vijñāna*). *See* fundamental consciousness; store consciousness.

manas. See thought.

mental activity (*caitta*): An activity of mind, such as joy, sloth, or anger.

mental consciousness (*mano-vijñāna*): The perceptive function of the mind. Each of the organs, including the mind, has a corresponding consciousness by which objects are known. The consciousness of mind (*manas*) perceives thoughts. See also consciousness.

mind (*citta*): A synonym for the store consciousness (q.v.) or eighth consciousness.

mindless stage (*acittaka-bhūmi*): A stage of meditation.

modes (*niṣyanda*): Literally, “outflow.” Sometimes translated in this text as “similar,” as in “similar results” (*niṣyanda-phala*). “Mode” suggests that the object in question is not something different but merely a mode of the parent object.

name-and-form (*nāma-rūpa*): Another name for the physical body endowed with consciousness (q.v.).

nature of being dependent on others. See three natures.

nirvāṇa with no fixed abode (*apraṭiṣṭhita-nirvāṇa*): The true *nirvāṇa*, because it is not seized or made into an object of attachment by the one who enjoys it. It is the true *nirvāṇa* because by neither spurning the world and grasping *nirvāṇa* nor becoming trapped in the delusion and attachments of the ordinary world, one dwells in the true *nirvāṇa*.

nirvāṇa without remainder (*nirupadhiśeṣa-nirvāṇa*): “Remainder” refers to body and mind as support. This is the *nirvāṇa* one continues to enjoy after death, when one is without body and mind.

nonreturner (*anāgāmin*): One who has advanced very far in spiritual practices but dies before reaching the goal. He will not be reborn again but will become an arhat (q.v.) after death.

no self (*anātman*): The Buddhist teaching that persons do not possess nor are composed of any permanent self, person, soul, or substance of any kind. Belief in a self is a delusion and the basis of all suffering.

obstacle (*āvaraṇa*): Obstacles to spiritual awakening, which include such things as belief in a self or substance, craving, hatred, attachment to things, etc. See also passions.

obstacle of not desiring to practice benefitting others (*parahita-caryā-akāmaṇa-āvaraṇa*): By entering final *nirvāṇa*, one avoids future rebirth. Consequently one cannot save other beings from delusion and pain.

- obstacle of the final *nirvāṇa* of the lower vehicles (*hinayāna-parinirvāṇa-āvaraṇa*): By desiring final *nirvāṇa* and turning one's back on the world, one fails to achieve the real *nirvāṇa*. Attachment to *nirvāṇa* is thus an obstacle.
- part [of consciousness] that authenticates self-authentication (*svasaṃvitti-saṃvitti-bhāga*): That function of consciousness that knows that it knows that there is an object.
- passions (*kleśa*): Desire, aversion, delusion, and other attachments that hinder the practice of the Buddhist path and the realization of *nirvāṇa*. *See also* obstacle.
- path of added effort (*prayoga-mārga*): A preliminary meditative practice preceding the paths of insight and cultivation. *See also* path of cultivation; path of equipment; path of insight.
- path of cultivation (*bhāvanā-mārga*): One of two main forms of meditation, consisting of the repetitious contemplation of some truth that one has discovered. *See also* state of cultivation.
- path of equipment (*saṃbhāra-mārga*): Bodhisattvas are required to accumulate merit and wisdom, prior to undertaking the path of added effort (q.v.). *See also* state of equipment.
- path of insight (*darśana-mārga*): The meditative practice of gaining clear insight into the true state of things. It is followed by the path of cultivation (q.v.); the two paths together constitute the main meditative practices.
- patience (*kṣānti*): The third of the six or ten perfections developed by bodhisattvas. *See also* perfection.
- patience with regard to the nonbirth of dharmas (*anutpattika-dharma-kṣānti*): The special ability of bodhisattvas to remain calm and fearless in the face of the knowledge that inasmuch as all things are empty, they neither are produced nor cease.
- perfected nature (*pariniṣpanna-svabhāva*). *See* three natures.
- perfection (*pāramitā*): A group of six or ten aspects of practice that a bodhisattva performs in order to attain Buddhahood: (1) giving (*dāna*), (2) discipline (*śīla*), (3) patience (*kṣānti*), (4) vigor or effort (*virya*), (5) contemplation (*dhyāna*), (6) wisdom (*prajñā*), (7) skill in means (or expedient) (*upāya*), (8) vow (*prañidhāna*), (9) power (*śāla*), and (10) knowledge (*jñāna*). The six perfections are the first six of the ten perfections. The perfections are coordinated with the stages so that one perfection, such as the perfection of giving (q.v.), is emphasized on each stage. *See also* stage.

- perfection of giving (*dāna-pāramitā*): Giving is perfected when it is done with no concept of gift, giver, or recipient. *See also* perfection.
- perfuming (*vāsanā*): The residue or lingering influence of action (q.v.) that impregnates the store consciousness (q.v.) and influences future decisions and actions. The residue of actions is figuratively compared to the perfume that impregnates a piece of cloth and gives it a specific character.
- post-learner (*aśaikṣa*): One who has gone beyond the need for spiritual training, the antonym of learner (q.v.).
- pratyekabuddha* (“solitary buddha”): One who attains *nirvāṇa* by contemplating the law of causation without the help of a teacher.
- presence (*abhimukhī*): One of the ten [bodhisattva] stages (q.v.).
- propensities (*anuśaya*): The potential to act ignorantly and karmically.
- pure subsequently acquired knowledge (*prṣṭhalabdha-anāsrava-jñāna*): Knowledge that things are or are not the case, following states of meditation and insight in which it cannot be said that things are true, untrue, etc.; knowledge of events in the light of emptiness (q.v.).
- realm of desire (*kāma-dhātu*): The lowest of the three realms of existence in Buddhist cosmology. It covers the earth and several celestial realms. Above it is the realm of form (q.v.), and above these two is the formless realm (q.v.).
- realm of form (*rūpa-dhātu*): The realm of form is so called because subtle material form still exists in it. *See also* formless realm; realm of desire.
- realm of the Dharma (*dharma-dhātu*): Existence as it really is, which is marked by the interdependent existence of things, emptiness (q.v.), impermanence, etc.
- result of similar species (*niṣyanda-phala*): A result that is of the same moral species as its cause.
- retribution (*vipāka*): The matured results of previous action (q.v.). The character of the eighth or store consciousness (q.v.) is the result or retribution of previous karmic deeds. Likewise, the senses, such as sight, are the result of former acts.
- samādhi*: Often translated as “meditation.” *Samādhi* is a mental state in which the mind is focused on one point to the exclusion of all else. The state is defined as “one-pointedness of mind” (*citta-ekāgratā*).
- samādhi* of nonconceptualization (*asaṃjñika-samāpatti*): An advanced meditative state characterized by the absence of thought processes. Sometimes referred to as the unconscious *samādhi*.

samsāra. See Translator's Introduction, p. 5.

seed (*bija*): The inner habit energies that lie in the container consciousness.

seed consciousness (*bija-vijñāna*). See fundamental consciousness; store consciousness.

seeing part (*darśana-bhāga*): The function of mind that perceives mental images, which are known as the seen part (q.v.), and that thereby is led to the erroneous idea that the images are external to mind. All that exists in the system of the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun* are the two parts of mind, the seeing part and the seen part.

seen part (*nimitta-bhāga*): *Nimitta* is literally "sign" or "object." Delusion consists of believing that signs or objects exist outside mind. See also seeing part.

self (*ātman*): Imagined as a unitary, independent, permanent, unchanging, and perhaps eternal inner being, spirit, or substance. It is felt to be the "me" to which belong the body and mind, feelings, etc. Rejected by Buddhism as an illusion. See also self-nature.

self-authenticating part (*svasaṃvitti-bhāga*): That part of consciousness that knows that it perceives objects. The seeing part (q.v.) sees the seen part (q.v.), objects or images, and the self-authenticating part is that which knows that seeing has occurred.

self-nature (*svabhāva*): A sort of unitary, independent, permanent, unchanging, and perhaps eternal nature or substance which common sense tends to imagine that all phenomena possess. Rejected by Buddhism as an illusion. See also self.

sense bases (*āyatana*): The six sense organs (including mind) and their respective objects of perception. They are bases because they are the loci of perceptions.

sense consciousness. See consciousness.

sense field (*dhātu*): The eighteen sense fields are the six sense organs, their six corresponding perceptual objects, and the six corresponding forms of consciousness. Thus, for instance, there are eyes, material objects, and visual consciousness. When these three are present, there is an act of visual perception.

signlessness (*animitta*): The absence of signs or characteristics in the perceptions of an enlightened person. One of the three "doors of liberation," the other two being emptiness (q.v.) and wishlessness.

six perfections (*pāramitā*). See perfection.

six secondary passions (*upakleśa*): Faithlessness, indolence, thoughtlessness, forgetfulness, distraction, and inaccurate knowing.

six sense bases (*ṣaḍāyatana*): The six sense organs.

stage (*bhūmi*): A phase of spiritual training for bodhisattvas. The spiritual practices of bodhisattvas are variously divided into stages, states (*avasthā*), and paths (*mārga*). See also ten [bodhisattva] stages.

state of culmination (*niṣṭhā-avasthā*): The final state of spiritual development, the state of awakening from delusion that follows the path of cultivation (q.v.).

state of cultivation (*bhāvanā-avasthā*): The state of intense meditation on the path of the bodhisattva, characterized by repetitious contemplation of truths.

state of equipment (*sambhāra-avasthā*): Preliminary spiritual practices that prepare one for meditation and the superior stages. It involves such practices as moral reeducation.

state of thorough understanding (*pravedha-avasthā*). See path of insight.

store consciousness (*ālaya-vijñāna*): The eighth consciousness as storer of the seeds of delusion and awakening, impurity and purity. The fundamental concept of the system of the *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*. See also consciousness; fundamental consciousness.

stream-winner (*srota-āpanna*): One who has entered the "stream that flows to awakening and arhatship."

suffering (*duḥkha*): Also translated as "turmoil," "unrest," "imperfection," and "unsatisfactoriness." The first of the four noble truths (q.v.) of Buddhism. The plight of all unawakened beings.

suffering of suffering (*duḥkha-duḥkhatā*): Turmoil and unrest attendant on suffering from hunger, illness, loss, etc.

summits (*mūrdhana*): One of the aids to cognitive penetration.

Supreme Perfect Awakening (*anuttara-samyak-sambodhi*): The state of Buddhahood.

supreme worldly dharmas (*laukikāgra-dharma*): One of four aids to cognitive penetration (*nirvedha-bhāgiya*).

ten [bodhisattva] stages: Ten phases of spiritual training for bodhisattvas—extreme joy (*pramuditā*), immaculateness (*vimalā*), light emission (*prbhā-karī*), blazing discernment (*arciṣmatī*), difficult to vanquish (*sudurjayā*), presence (*abhimukhī*), far going (*dūramgamā*), unshakable (*acalā*), good discernment (*sādhumatī*), and cloud of the Dharma (*dharma-meghā*).

ten perfections. *See* perfection.

ten secondary passions: Thoughtlessness, agitation, torpor, faithlessness, indolence, wrong desires, wrong resolution, wrong memory, distraction, and inaccurate knowing.

thought (*manas*): The seventh of eight forms of consciousness, the one responsible for thought. It is *manas* that mistakenly believes that mental images are really external objects. *See also* consciousness.

three [Buddha] bodies: The first, primordial body of the Buddha is called the Dharma-*kāya* (Dharma body) or essential body (*svābhāvika-kāya*). It is immaterial, beyond conception, synonymous with absolute truth. The second is the enjoyment body (*saṃbhoga-kāya*), which takes two forms: the body of personal enjoyment (*svasaṃbhoga-kāya*) and the body for the enjoyment of others (*parasaṃbhoga-kāya*). The body of personal enjoyment is a glorified body of a Buddha, adorned with the thirty-two major marks and eighty minor marks, resulting from eons of spiritual practice. Only a Buddha enjoys this body; it is not known to others. The body for the enjoyment of others is also a glorified body of a Buddha, adorned with the thirty-two major marks and eighty minor marks, resulting from eons of spiritual practice; but advanced bodhisattvas can perceive this body, hence “for the enjoyment of others.” The third, earthly body is called the transformation body (*nirmāṇa-kāya*). It is the material body of a historical Buddha. The *saṃbhoga-kāya* and the *nirmāṇa-kāya* (enjoyment body and transformation body) are known collectively as the *rūpa-kāya* or form body.

threefold naturelessness. *See* three natures.

three natures (*trisvabhāva*): Three perspectives from which anything can be understood. (1) A falsely imagined nature (*parikalpita-svabhāva*), which is the false, illusory nature that things have of appearing as if they were real things existing outside of consciousness. (2) A nature of being dependent on others (*paratantra-svabhāva*), which is the state of existing only in dependence on other things. Since all things exist only interdependently, all things have this nature. (3) A perfected nature (*pariṇiṣpanna*), which is the true state, perceived without the obscurations of delusion and craving. The true nature of an object is said by the text to be the dependent nature minus the imagined nature. Since the three natures have no self-nature (q.v.), one sometimes speaks of their threefold naturelessness.

three transforming consciousnesses: The store consciousness (q.v.), thought (q.v.), and a third form of consciousness consisting of the seeing part (q.v.) and the seen part (q.v.) combined.

trance state/trance (*dhyāna*): Four increasingly refined stages of meditation, culminating in mental tranquility devoid of thought and feeling. *See also* attainment of cessation.

tranquility [of mind] (*samatha*): The practice of achieving mental stillness or calming, often combined with or followed by practices such as observation of mental physical states (*vipaśyanā*).

tranquility and insight (*samatha-vipaśyanā*): The classic Indian Buddhist form of meditation, in which there are preliminary exercises calculated to calm and stabilize the mind followed by active practices such as contemplating feelings, breathing, etc.

transformation body. *See* three [Buddha] bodies.

transmutation by breaking the power of impure seeds and increasing the efficacy of pure seeds (*balodghāṭa-prabhāva-vardhana-parāvṛtti*). *See* transmutation of the support.

transmutation of cultivation (*bhāvanā-parāvṛtti*). *See* transmutation of the support.

transmutation of the perfection of result (*phala-paripuri-parāvṛtti*). *See* transmutation of the support.

transmutation of the support (*āśraya-parāvṛtti*): “Support” refers to the eighth or store consciousness (q.v.) as the holder of seeds of delusion and enlightenment. This transmutation is a total change in the character of the store consciousness, whereby seeds of delusion are destroyed and seeds of enlightenment are nourished and made to mature. This is the culminating act during the spiritual practices of the bodhisattva.

transmutation of thorough understanding (*pravedha-parāvṛtti*). *See* transmutation of the support.

true nature of things (*dharmatā*): The way that all things really are when known apart from false imagination; ultimate reality.

true suchness (*bhūta-tathatā*): The “suchness” of things. The real nature of each thing as it is, apart from false imagining, perverted views, stereotyped interpretations, etc.

truth of the path (*mārga-satya*): The fourth of the four noble truths (q.v.), the truth of the method or path by means of which suffering is terminated. This path consists of meditation, the development of moral character, and the gaining of clear understanding.

twofold grasping (*grāhadvaya*): The grasper (q.v.) and the grasped (q.v.) combined.

ultimate truth (*paramārtha-satya*): The real truth about anything, as opposed to conventional truth (q.v.).

unassociated dharmas (*viprayukta-saṃskāra*): Factors not associated with consciousness, such as birth, generic similarity, the *samādhi* of cessation, etc.

ungraspable (*anupalabdha*): Beyond understanding.

universal mental activity (*sarvatraga-caitta*): Mental activities that accompany all states of mind.

unshakable (*acalā*): One of the ten [bodhisattva] stages (q.v.).

Vasubandhu (fl. ca. 300–400): An early Indian Mahayana teacher who was the author of many important texts. He is considered the founder of the Yogācāra (q.v.) school.

vehicle (*yāna*): One of the three main classifications into which Buddhist schools are divided—(1) the Theravada, often referred to as Hinayana (“Small Vehicle”), (2) the Mahayana (“Great Vehicle”), and (3) the Vajrayana (“Adamantine Vehicle”).

view (*dṛṣṭi*): “View” always means “false view” in Mahayana Buddhism. Any view is by definition an incorrect perception of events.

view of self (*ātma-dṛṣṭi*): The erroneous belief that one is, or has, a self, person, being, soul, or substance. According to all Buddhist schools, this is the fundamental delusion and source of all suffering. *See also* self; self-nature.

vital principle (*jīvitendriya*): The life force that, when present, marks a being as alive.

volition (*cetanā*): A deliberate choice to do something. Karma, or morally charged action, is always preceded by volition.

Yogācāra: A Buddhist school, founded in the fourth century by Vasubandhu, which advocates the doctrine of “mind only.”

Selected Bibliography

I. English

- Anacker, Stefan, trans. and ed. *Seven Works of Vasubandhu*. Delhi: Motilal Barnarsidass, 1984.
- Chatterjee, K. N., trans. *Vasubandhu's Vijñapti-mātrata-siddhi with Sthiramati's Commentary: Text with English Translation*. Varanasi: Kisher Vidya Niketa, 1980.
- Dasgupta, Surendranath. *Indian Idealism*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1962.
- Ganguly, Swati, trans. *Treatise in Thirty Verses on Mere-consciousness: A Critical English Translation of Hsuan-Tsang's Chinese Version of the Vijñaptimātratāśāstra with Notes from Dharmapala's Commentary in Chinese*. Delhi: Motilal Barnarsidass, 1992.
- Hamilton, Clarence H., trans. *Wei Shih Er Shih Lun: The Treatise in Twenty Stanzas on Representation Only*. American Oriental Series, vol. 13. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 1938.
- Inazu, Kizo. "The Concept of Vijñapti and Vijñāna in the Text of Vasubandhu's *Vimśatika-vijñapti-mātratā-siddhi*." *Indogaku Bukkyō-gaku Kenkyū* 15.1 (1967).
- Katsumata, Shunkyo. "Vijñaptimātratāśāstra and the *Buddha-bhūmi-sūtra*." *Indogaku Bukkyō-gaku Kenkyū* 7.1 (1958): 13:22.
- Kochumuttom, Thomas A. *A Buddhist Doctrine of Experience: A New Translation and Interpretation of the Works of Vasubandhu the Yogācārin*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.
- Nagao, Gadjin. *Madhyamika and Yogacara: A Study of Mahayana Philosophies*. Edited and translated by L. S. Kawamura. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1991.
- Paul, Diana Y. *Philosophy of Mind in Sixth-Century China: Paramārtha's Evolution of Consciousness*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1984.
- Powers, John. *The Yogacara School of Buddhism: A Bibliography*. ATLA Bibliography Series, No. 27. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1991.

Bibliography

- Rahu, P. T. *Idealistic Thought in India*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953.
- Sharma, T. R., trans. *Vijnaptimatratasiddhi (Vimsatika): with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers, 1993.
- Tanaka, Junsho. "Ālayavijñāna Explained in the Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi." *Tōyō Gaku Ronshu* (1952): 215–236.
- Tat, Wei, trans. *Ch'eng Wei-Shih Lun: Doctrine of Mere Consciousness*. Hong Kong: Ch'eng Wei-Shih Lun Publication Committee, 1973.
- Weinstein, Stanley. "The Concept of Ālaya-vijñāna in Early Yogācāra Buddhism: A Comparison of Its Meaning in the *Samdhinirmocana-sūtra* and the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi of Dharmapāla*." *Kokusai Tōhō Gakusha Kaigikiyō* 3 (1959): 46–58.

II. French

- Levi, Sylvain. *Un système de philosophie bouddhique: matériaux pour l'étude du système Vijñaptimātra*. Paris: H. Champion, 1932.
- Poussin, Louis de la Vallée, trans. *Vijñaptimātratā: La Siddhi de Hiuan-Tsang*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1928.

III. German

- Jacobi, Hermann, trans. *Trimsikavijnapti des Vasubandhu: Mit Bhasya des Acarya Sthiramati*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1932.

IV. Japanese

- Fukaura, Seibun. *Yuishiki gaku kenkyū*. 2 vols. 2d ed. Tokyo: Nagata Bunshō Dō, 1963.
- Hsüan-tsang. *Ch'eng wei-shih lun*. Vol. 31, no. 1585 of *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*.
- K'uei-chi. *Ch'eng wei-shih lun shu-chi*. Vol. 43, no. 1830 of *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō*.

Index

A

- Abhidharmasamuccaya* (text)
 68–69, 78, 80, 102, 134,
 176, 204, 267, 275, 331,
 356–357
- Abhidharmasamuccaya-
 vyākhyā* (text) 157, 160,
 213–214
- abode(s) 245, 272, 316, 319,
 332, 342–343, 345, 348
 of the imageless 316
 of Maheśvara 245
nirvāṇa with no fixed 319,
 342, 348
 three 332
- acquisition 29–30, 111, 150,
 279, 293, 314
 three kinds of 30
 ultimate truth of 293
- act
 bodily indicative 27–28
- action 11–12, 15, 18–19, 28,
 59, 64, 67–68, 71, 133, 154,
 160, 165, 197, 251,
 263–268, 270, 273–278,
 317, 326, 334, 348, 352,
 356, 363–364, 381, 392,
 395, 405
 three kinds of 28, 154, 317,
 348, 352, 363
- activity(ies) 27, 29, 32, 38–40,
 64, 67, 98, 106, 109,
 114–115, 134, 155, 251,
 326, 328, 331, 348
- actual 299–300
 of the doer 251
 identical 252–253, 258
 mode of 60, 71, 98–99, 105,
 130, 135, 155, 206,
 215–216, 248, 257, 258,
 272, 315, 347, 351
- āgama* 87–88
- aggregate(s) 9, 12–14, 25, 29,
 36, 39–40, 51, 69, 87,
 89–90, 93, 100, 102–103,
 117–118, 129, 185–189,
 191, 195, 219, 263, 274,
 281, 295, 311, 357–358, 367
 of form 117–118, 311
 grasped 186
 that are grasped 13–14, 89,
 103, 185, 188, 274
 that lasts up to the end of
saṃsāra 89
- aggregation 21, 25–26
- agitation 134–137, 179, 182,
 197, 200–201, 204–206
- aid 153, 158, 229, 240, 242,
 246, 249, 266, 297–298,
 301–302, 315, 319, 327
- Ājīvikas* (school) 23
- Ālambana-parīkṣā* (text) 116,
 119
- anger 14, 135, 181, 189,
 197–198, 206–207, 209,
 215, 405–406
- antagonism 132
- antidote 88, 145, 175, 177, 179,
 226, 273, 404
- arhat 29, 78–80, 92, 140–141,
 226, 276–277, 331–332
- Āryadeśanāvīkhyāpana Śāstra*
 141
- ascertainment in accordance
 with reality 303
- associated 10, 23, 53, 57, 61,
 67–68, 71–74, 80, 82,

Index

89–91, 94–95, 97,
101–102, 107–108, 111,
125–128, 131–147, 151,
155–157, 159–163,
170–173, 177, 180–184,
188–192, 194, 195,
203–204, 206–208, 210,
213–215, 218–219, 225,
229, 236, 244, 260, 274, 282,
299–300, 310–311,
326–327, 332–333,
347–352, 356–357, 365,
370, 403
atom 11–12, 21–22, 24–27,
398–402
attachment 134, 142, 175, 180,
185, 187–189, 194–195,
199, 266, 290, 324,
327–328, 331, 338
cessation of 13–16
cessation of attachment to
dharma 39–43
to dharma 16–20,
143–144, 194, 324
object of 47
to self 9–13, 140, 150–152,
324, 327
sensual 89–90
attainment(s) 32, 296
formless 32
two, of unconsciousness 32
attention 69, 73, 90, 123, 132,
157–158, 165–169, 171,
220, 298, 326, 350, 352
avarice 207
aversion 213
Avici (hell) 162
awakening 50, 79, 82, 130,
168, 177, 182, 239–240,
297–298, 314, 317–318,
322, 331, 339, 404
aspect of 182

great 79, 177

B

bad conduct 325
Bandhuśrī (Buddhist teacher)
1
being 9–12, 15, 30, 47, 60,
63–65, 66, 71, 73, 75, 79,
81, 82, 87, 89, 94–95,
98–99, 101–103, 109–110,
130–131, 143, 146, 150,
161, 163, 168, 172, 180,
182, 191, 221, 222,
225–228, 235, 237–240,
245, 247, 259, 263, 269,
277, 298, 299, 304, 308,
311–314, 316–318,
320–324, 330, 335–336,
341–344, 348–353, 359,
361, 364–366, 370, 393,
395–396, 404–406
ordinary 30, 53, 64, 81, 143,
146, 152, 222, 225, 227,
245, 277, 304, 323–324
ordinary people 9, 29, 81, 86,
90, 92, 324, 361, 403
sentient 15, 30, 47, 50–51,
65, 71, 73, 75, 81, 89,
94–95, 99, 101, 103, 109,
130–131, 150–151, 161,
221, 228, 237, 240, 247,
259, 263, 298–299, 308,
311, 314, 316–318, 325,
344, 348–349, 351–353,
359, 364–365, 393,
404–406
benefitting 82, 154, 175, 177,
180, 301, 316–317, 318,
320, 330, 342–344,
364–365
others 177, 301, 330,

- 365–366
 - sentient beings 180, 316, 318, 320
 - benevolence 348
 - Bhāvaviveka (Buddhist teacher) 93
 - birth 13, 15, 30, 32, 33–35, 46, 48, 51, 75–78, 84–85, 95–96, 98–99, 120, 131, 162, 193, 209, 216, 221, 226–227, 229, 242, 244–245, 263–264, 266, 268–280, 284, 291, 294, 325, 328, 343–345
 - and death 13, 15, 98–99, 131, 227, 244, 263–264, 266, 268, 276–279
 - forms of 48, 75, 95, 96
 - bodhisattva
 - nonregressing 79, 81
 - path 318
 - practice 277
 - body(ies) 11–12, 28–29, 31, 58–60, 65–67, 89–90, 94, 96–100, 102–106, 109–110, 117–118, 120, 124, 133, 135, 154, 159–160, 163, 178, 183, 185, 189, 194, 210, 223–224, 237, 245–247, 268–269, 276–278, 283–284, 311, 342–343, 347–348, 351–352, 355–358, 359–367, 392, 396, 400, 405
 - embryonic material 100
 - made of mind 276
 - provided with organs 60, 96–97, 120
 - supporting 66
 - three 361, 364
 - transformation 277–278, 353, 361–364, 366
 - bond 37, 86, 151, 210–212, 241, 273, 305, 344–345
 - bondage 150–151, 360
 - Brahma (god) 20, 187, 208
 - Buddha
 - body 362, 366
 - dharmas 147, 318
 - land 366
 - non- 246, 356
 - world 36
 - Buddhabhūmi Sūtra* 154, 351–352
 - Buddhahood 3–4, 59, 177, 243, 245–246, 279, 322, 325, 331, 336, 348–350, 353, 365
- C**
- candle wick 60
 - Candrapāla (Buddhist teacher) 49, 52
 - capacity(ies) 51, 248–250, 253, 264, 321, 330, 361
 - material 248
 - of one who has understood 250
 - twenty-two 248, 250
 - category(ies) 18–19, 29, 66, 84, 92, 100, 176, 182, 205, 209, 216–218, 223, 240, 290, 300, 311, 324, 333, 357
 - causality 93, 187, 241
 - cause(s) 17, 20–22, 24–25, 27–28, 30–31, 34, 37, 45–46, 48, 50, 52–57, 59–60, 66, 70–71, 74–78, 83–84, 86, 88–89, 91, 94, 96, 99, 109–111, 114–117, 121, 126, 152, 166–167,

- 173–174, 176, 181, 185,
187, 195, 210, 231, 240,
242–243, 250–256,
257–259, 261, 264,
267–268, 270–271,
273–279, 284, 297–298,
302, 355–356, 359,
365–367, 382
- attracting 57, 252, 258
- condition as 52–53, 55, 57,
60, 114, 126, 144, 242–243,
253–255, 259, 264–265,
274–275, 284
- of existence 265
- generating 253–256
- instrumental 253–256
- nonopposing 253, 258
- opposing 252
- particular 252, 258
- productive 57, 251, 254, 258
- projecting 251, 253–254,
258
- remaining 253–254, 256,
267
- single 20, 57
- ten 250–256, 259, 271
- celestial(s) 30, 35, 65, 89, 102,
124, 137, 150, 155, 161,
169, 221, 223, 224, 235,
245, 272, 394
- consisting of thought 224
- unconscious 89, 102, 150,
221–222
- who are oblivious in their
play 124, 169
- cessation 13, 15, 33–34,
37–39, 43, 67, 75–78,
83–85, 87, 90–92, 97,
103–108, 113, 122, 129,
139–143, 149, 156, 188,
193, 195–196, 208–209,
222–224, 226–227, 235,
251, 255, 271, 287–288,
291–292, 309, 323–324,
328, 329, 336, 344–345,
359, 362–363, 367
- immediate 251, 255
- of mental activity 106–108,
222
- not resulting from discrimina-
tion 287, 344–345
- resulting from discrimination
92, 287, 292, 324, 336,
344–345
- resulting from the absence of
conditions 37–38, 97
- characteristic(s) 16–17, 23,
26–27, 29, 31, 33–34, 37,
42, 45, 47–48, 53–58,
60–62, 64, 69–71, 74, 77,
86, 93, 96, 104, 113, 130,
136, 145, 153, 157–160,
164–165, 168, 170,
172–175, 178–181, 185,
188, 191, 194–197,
199–204, 206–207,
209–211, 213, 221, 229,
231, 233–235, 237–238,
240, 242, 248, 250, 267,
269–270, 272, 274, 283,
285–288, 290, 295, 297–
298, 301–304, 306–314,
318–319, 322–323,
327–329, 334, 336, 338,
341, 343–344, 347–348,
352, 355–356, 358–360,
362, 364–365, 370,
396–397, 399, 401–402
- characteristiclessness 329, 336
- Ch'eng wei-shih lun* (text)
1–4, 6
- Citrabhānu (Buddhist teacher)
1–2
- class 37, 51, 72, 78, 80, 91, 134,

- 158–159, 194, 217, 224,
- 240, 252–253, 277,
- 282–284, 298–299, 308,
- 310–311, 321, 323–324,
- 326, 333, 347–353, 355,
- 357, 358–359, 361, 363
- clinging 29, 187, 195
 - to mere personal morality and ritualism 187
- coarseness 272, 314, 324–332, 335–337, 362
 - twofold 337
- coldness 99
- color 17, 22–23, 25, 27, 35, 158, 229, 401
- compassion 125, 176, 179, 180–182, 199, 276, 278, 318, 342, 344, 348, 365–366, 369
 - great 176, 278, 342, 344
- comprehension 249, 309, 311–312, 325
 - six 311
 - of truth(s) 249, 312
- conceptualization 68–70, 73, 105–109, 132, 149, 158, 165, 167, 175, 200, 211, 221–224, 288
- condition 9–10, 12, 14–15, 20–21, 25–27, 33–34, 38–40, 46–47, 49, 52–53, 55, 57, 60, 66, 69, 71, 74–76, 83, 86, 97, 100, 106–107, 110, 114–118, 121, 124–127, 129, 137, 144, 148, 151, 164, 167, 187, 217, 219–220, 222, 226–228, 233, 241–248, 250–256, 258, 261, 263–266, 268, 272, 274–277, 279, 283–289, 293–295, 311, 316, 321, 326, 343, 348, 358, 363–364, 366, 369
- immediately antecedent 124–127, 148, 228, 244–246, 251, 255, 259, 275
- as object 25–26, 187, 247, 251, 255, 259, 275, 283–284, 293, 311
- similar and immediately antecedent 115, 124–127, 228, 244–246, 251, 255, 259, 275
- conditioned arising 69, 76–78, 266, 270, 275, 316
- conscience 173–176, 178, 180, 182, 197, 199, 200, 204–205, 335
 - lack of 20, 174, 197, 200
- consciousness(cs) 9, 10, 13–16, 18, 20, 23–28, 31–32, 37, 39–43, 45, 47–52, 56–75, 77–105, 107–111, 113–133, 135–136, 138–177, 181, 183, 186–187, 190–191, 206, 210, 213–214, 218–222, 225, 226–229, 231, 233–249, 259–261, 263–264, 266–279, 281–284, 287–288, 296–299, 301–304, 306–307, 310, 314–315, 326–327, 330, 332–333, 335, 338–340, 347–351, 356–359, 361–367, 369–370, 391–393, 395–398, 402–408
- eighth 13, 32, 39, 45–46, 48–50, 52, 58, 61, 67, 73–74, 81–87, 91, 93–99, 101–103, 109–110, 117, 119–123, 125, 127, 130,

Index

- 138, 141–142, 145, 162,
- 170, 183, 213, 220, 227,
- 243, 245, 247, 249, 260,
- 338, 340, 350–351, 362
- evolution of 10, 45, 66
- of form 116, 154, 391, 398
- fundamental 15, 48, 85, 220,
- 227
- immaculate 81–82
- imperceptible 99, 105
- internal 10, 25, 28, 40, 131,
- 234, 237, 239, 261, 263,
- 279, 391–392
- mental 15, 48, 85, 99, 101,
- 107–108, 113, 117–120,
- 122–125, 127, 129, 141,
- 148–149, 153, 155–156,
- 159–161, 163, 170, 172,
- 181, 190, 210, 213–214,
- 219–220, 227–229, 238,
- 282, 397, 402–403
- object of 26, 61
- only 39, 61, 63, 65, 97, 128,
- 219, 233–237, 239–240,
- 288, 296–298, 301–302,
- 306, 310, 314, 369–370,
- 391, 397–398, 407–408
- perfumed 59, 340, 395
- as retribution 32, 49, 51,
- 58–59, 64–65, 67, 71, 79,
- 81–82, 97–98, 103–104,
- 113, 116, 118, 120–121,
- 132, 143, 228, 246, 267,
- 299, 349
- root 88, 241–243, 248–249,
- 259, 263–264, 267, 279,
- 297, 314, 335, 338–339
- seed 242
- seventh 13, 39, 45, 80, 114,
- 119–122, 125, 141–142,
- 144–145, 147, 152–153,
- 206, 245, 247, 282, 327,
- 330, 332, 351, 357
- six 45, 92, 94, 119, 120,
- 123–125, 127, 142, 146,
- 148, 151–157, 163–164,
- 181, 219, 221–222,
- 226–227, 243, 267, 333, 397
- sixth 13–14, 39, 80, 83, 100,
- 103, 105, 121, 123, 125,
- 147, 154, 183, 206, 213,
- 220, 246, 248, 326–327, 332
- store 33, 58, 71, 79, 80, 86,
- 114–115, 119, 121–122,
- 125, 128–132, 138–139,
- 141, 145, 150–156, 163,
- 170, 190, 225, 282–283,
- 299, 351, 361–363
- that supports life and heat
- 97
- three transforming 233
- transformation of 24, 27, 37,
- 42–43, 65, 67, 406
- transformations of 9, 26,
- 119, 237, 350
- transforming 47–48,
- 113–114, 128, 153, 233,
- 366–367
- transmutation of 315, 349
- visual 25, 49, 74–75, 83,
- 87–89, 92, 94, 96, 99–100,
- 102, 104, 109, 116,
- 118–119, 124, 142, 144,
- 148, 153, 155, 156, 164,
- 229, 236, 238, 403
- contact 18, 27, 68–71, 73–75,
- 82, 101–102, 107–108, 128,
- 132, 135, 137, 158, 165,
- 168–169, 179, 181, 210,
- 260, 267, 270–272
- physical 27
- contemplation 14, 39, 86, 188,
- 196, 210, 224, 235, 250,
- 252, 258, 308–310,

321–322, 328–329, 332,
336, 343, 369
discursive 224, 250
of nonestablished truth 308
of the truths 196
continuity 76, 78, 86, 100, 204,
256, 263, 391, 396, 404–406
of birth and death 263
of cause and effect 78
one's own 256
convention of reason 231
covetousness 73, 108, 132
craving 70, 107, 131, 134–136,
147, 160, 166, 169, 172,
177, 180, 185, 188–195,
197–200, 203–205,
207–208, 215, 218, 222,
224, 273, 299–300, 317,
326, 363
cultivation 14, 39, 55, 131,
143, 148, 159, 176–178,
184, 186, 194–195, 209,
217, 223–226, 265,
272–274, 297–298, 300,
313, 315, 317, 319,
321–322, 325–327,
331–333, 336, 338, 350,
353, 355

D

Dārṣṭāntika (school) 92
deceit 206–208
defiled 53, 66, 72, 81, 94, 125,
131–141, 145–147,
149–151, 156, 174, 177,
180–182, 185–186, 189,
197, 199–207, 211–212,
216, 218, 224, 237–238,
243, 245, 252, 271–273,
285, 288, 314, 324–325,
335, 338–339, 351, 366

defilements 53, 140–159, 182,
185, 341, 364
adventitious 53
deity 20
delight 89, 159–164, 166, 173,
177, 180, 190–191, 193,
224, 249, 328, 343
delusion(s) 10, 13, 22, 48,
84–85, 130–131, 134, 145,
147, 160, 167, 177,
190–193, 195, 197–199,
201–205, 207, 209–211,
213, 239, 268, 282, 300,
324–331, 338–339, 404
two 324–331
desire 20, 31, 67, 70, 72, 82, 89,
99, 101–102, 117–118,
132–133, 136, 138–139,
158–160, 165–166,
169–174, 180–181,
183–184, 189, 191–193,
195, 202, 208, 210,
215–217, 223, 225–226,
228, 245, 249–250, 268,
300, 306, 309, 317, 330, 348
desirelessness 292
destination 48, 394
Dharma 5, 11, 51, 54, 79, 87,
174, 175, 198, 199, 200,
217, 240, 296, 297, 311,
312, 315, 316, 317, 327,
334, 341, 355, 356, 358,
359, 361, 365, 366, 382
cloud of 316, 349
nature 365, 368
rain of 348, 353
Dharma body(ies) 315, 316,
352, 353, 355, 360–366, 383
of enjoyment 360–361, 363,
365
for the enjoyment of others
353, 361

Index

- essential 360–362, 364, 366
- of personal enjoyment 352, 364–366
- dharma(s) 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14–16, 18–24, 27, 29–30, 36, 38–39, 40–43, 50–52, 54, 72, 87, 95, 105, 109, 131–132, 174–175, 198–200, 217, 240, 259–260, 296–297, 312, 315–317, 327, 334, 341, 348, 350, 353, 355–356, 358–363, 365–366, 398, 402
- indeterminate 30, 72, 81, 96, 144, 177, 202
- instantaneous 77
- pure and impure 50, 52, 91
- six 288
- supramundane 55
- three 33, 59, 97–98, 367
- unassociated 90
- unconditioned 24, 30, 33–34, 36–38, 58–59, 67, 252, 256
- Dharmapāla (Buddhist teacher) 1–2, 49, 51, 79, 121, 136, 164, 171
- differentiation 34–35, 138, 328, 334
- difficult to vanquish 315
- Dignāga (Buddhist teacher) 116, 259, 260
- direct awareness 402
- discernment(s) 72, 82, 131, 133–135, 137, 142–143, 146, 158, 168–171, 176–177, 180–181, 186, 190, 192, 203–205, 207, 211–212, 223–224, 282, 299, 301, 303, 309, 311, 315–317, 319, 320–322, 326, 342, 344
- bad 203
- blazing 315
- good 177, 181, 316
- supreme 316
- two 131
- disciple 51, 55, 82, 88, 143, 208, 224–245, 277, 342, 363
- discrimination 37–38, 67, 74, 79–80, 92, 108, 121, 124, 131–132, 148, 160–161, 171, 186–188, 190–194, 205, 209, 213–214, 217–218, 229, 238, 282, 287–290, 292, 300, 305, 307–311, 323–324, 335–336, 341, 344–345, 347, 356, 404, 407
- disentanglement 241, 256–258, 320
- result of 257, 320
- disgust 32, 64–65, 89, 104, 106, 108, 129, 180, 224, 270, 276, 306
- disposition(s) 182, 227, 297, 301, 308, 318–319, 348, 352, 365, 366
- inherent 297
- two 297
- dissimulation 197, 207
- distracted 82, 98, 167, 170–171, 183, 193, 203, 207, 228, 356, 358
- distraction 135–137, 167, 169, 170–181, 203–205, 207
- dominant 46, 48, 55, 58, 114, 117–118, 127, 148, 187, 241, 248, 255–261, 263–266, 268, 274, 278, 323, 345, 364, 366, 393–394, 404, 406
- condition 46, 55, 58, 114,

117–118, 127, 144, 148,
187, 248, 255, 258–261,
263, 265–266, 364, 366, 404
result 257–259, 268, 278
doubt 10, 132, 136, 148, 162,
167–168, 185–186,
188–192, 194–195, 203,
207, 237, 239–240, 279,
299–300, 348, 351, 353,
361, 370, 391
dravya 18
dreams 238–239, 286, 392,
402, 404–405
objects in 238–239
drowsiness 134, 181, 201
dullness 99, 133, 185,
201–202, 210, 246, 326
duration 33–35, 120

E

effort 88, 109, 165–166, 169,
177, 179, 216–217, 235,
241, 249, 297, 298, 302,
305, 307, 312, 316–317,
319, 321, 329, 333, 335, 337
added 169, 177, 216, 249,
297–298, 302, 305, 307,
312, 319, 321, 329, 333,
335, 337, 382
human 241
Ekottarāgama (text) 87, 89–90
elements 16–18, 41, 50–51,
64, 66, 69, 218, 273,
394–395
four 18
great 64, 66, 394–395
three 16–17, 69
emptiness 14, 38–40, 53–54,
79, 93, 143–144, 195, 225,
234, 236–237, 240, 245,
249, 282, 285–287,
291–292, 296, 298–299,
304, 307–308, 315, 317,
322, 329–330, 332, 334,
336–337, 343–344, 350,
406
of beings 317, 322, 330, 336,
343, 350
of dharmas 39, 143–144,
237, 240, 249, 299, 317,
332, 344, 350
of object 304
three kinds of 291
twofold 285, 291, 296,
307–308, 315, 334, 337
energies 45, 48, 51, 116, 119,
129, 241, 243, 257,
263–266, 284
engendered 268–269, 317
entirety 209, 397–398,
407–408
envy 207–209
equipment 32, 94, 177, 240,
249, 297–298, 300–302,
321, 335
stage of 32, 298
eternalism 186, 188, 191, 234,
271
ether 20, 63, 391–392, 394,
400–401
evolution 10, 45, 66, 228, 278
existence 14–15, 19, 22–23,
26, 31–32, 34, 37, 51, 66,
69, 71, 77–78, 83–88, 91,
93, 98, 102–104, 111,
136–137, 139–140, 144,
146, 149–150, 152, 175,
185, 187, 191, 193,
212–213, 221, 223–225,
234, 236–237, 248, 250,
265–266, 268, 276, 282,
284, 285–286, 304, 329,
347, 395, 397, 402–403, 407

Index

homogeneous 103
intermediate 193, 268
peak of 137, 139–140,
224–225, 250
realm of 102
expedient 55, 152, 199, 254
extreme joy 315

F

- faculty(ies) 17, 25, 49–50, 124,
160–163, 165, 168, 172, 176,
184, 249, 269, 324, 333
mental 124, 249, 269
three pure 50
twenty-two 49
visual 25
Fa-hsiang School 2, 5
faith 53, 73, 82, 106, 127, 135,
137, 155, 167, 169, 173–174,
176, 178, 180, 182–184,
203, 218, 249–250, 298,
312, 317
faithlessness 134–136,
173–174, 203
families 50–51, 55–56
fearlessness 316, 360
feeling 31, 38, 61, 68–71, 73,
82, 89, 95, 100, 105–108,
132, 137–138, 158–165,
172, 175, 181, 184, 190–192,
200, 206, 214, 224–225, 249,
251–252, 267, 270–272,
274–275, 288, 311
flowers
illusive 34
forces 29, 252, 266, 269–270,
272–275, 286, 288, 328
karmic 266, 270, 272–275,
286, 288, 328
superior, of the same species
252
forgetfulness 135, 137, 203,
326
form 9–10, 12–14, 17–18,
21–33, 35–40, 45, 47–48,
52, 57, 59–60, 63, 67, 75, 81,
87–91, 93, 95–96, 98–105,
107, 110, 114–122, 124,
126–127, 129, 136, 139,
142, 145, 147–148, 151,
153–155, 157, 161–162,
179, 186, 192, 198, 208,
223–224, 236, 238–239,
245–246, 248, 260, 263,
267–270, 275, 288, 293,
295–296, 300, 305–306,
309, 313, 335, 337, 339,
342, 344–345, 347–348,
351, 356–357, 359,
361–365, 391, 395–402,
404–406
apparent 396
of birth 48, 75, 84, 95–96,
269
gross 21, 24, 26
indicative 27
nonindicative 27
ten sense bases of 66, 238,
396, 398
foundation 88, 166, 250–252,
255–258, 348
consisting of activity 251
consisting of the activity of
the doer 251
consisting of immediate
cessation 251, 255
consisting of nonobstruction
252
consisting of obstruction 252
consisting of perfuming 251
consisting of promotion 252,
257
consisting of special power

252
 consisting of true view 251,
 257
 consisting of union 252
 four immeasurables 301
 four perfect relinquishments
 31
 fruit 28, 32, 48, 50, 52, 56–57,
 59, 62, 110–111, 137,
 143–144, 155, 173, 187,
 216, 224, 243, 245, 253
 of Buddhahood 59, 243
 of good karma 138
 myrobalan 50, 52

G

Gandharva 392
Ghanavyūha Sūtra 42, 63
 grasped 11–14, 16, 23–24, 38,
 40, 43, 60, 69, 71, 89, 96,
 103, 129, 131, 136, 158,
 185–186, 188–189, 218,
 228, 233–234, 237–238,
 261, 266, 274, 281–283,
 285–288, 290–291, 295,
 298–299, 303–304, 306,
 309, 313, 334, 339,
 398–399, 401, 407
 grasper 266, 282–283, 285,
 298–299, 303–304,
 306–307, 309, 313, 407
 grasping(s) 10, 70, 101, 103,
 110, 122, 130–131, 135,
 138, 191, 233, 250, 263–266,
 268, 270–276, 278,
 282–283, 286, 288, 291–292,
 295, 298–299, 302–305,
 307, 311, 313, 328, 334,
 337, 349, 392
 two/twofold 264, 282, 283,
 291–292, 298–299, 302,

304–305, 311, 313, 349
 Great Lord 20, 21
 Great Sage 315
 Guṇamati (Buddhist teacher) 1

H

habit energy 45–46, 50, 59,
 263–266, 275, 291
 of grasping a self 265
 of names and expressions
 264
 of similar species 45
 of the cause of existence 265
 hairs of a tortoise 20
 harmfulness 199, 207
 harmless 199
 hatred 177, 185, 188, 189, 192,
 195, 197–199, 203–204,
 207, 299, 363, 406
 heat 18, 31, 52, 97–98, 100,
 103–105, 249, 302–305,
 311–312
 heedlessness of blame 135
 Hinayana 87, 148
 hindrance 210, 331
 holy ones 54, 64
 horns of a rabbit 12, 18, 37,
 284
 Hossō (Fa-hsiang) School 2
 hostility 198, 207
 Hsüan-tsang (Buddhist teacher)
 1–3, 5, 375, 388, 389
 hungry ghost 161, 163, 392
 hypocrisy 180, 199, 206–208

I

idle discourse 96, 157, 289,
 306, 313, 356, 358, 360
 seeds of 96, 157
 ignorance 107, 131, 136–137,
 146–147, 176, 185, 195, 215

Index

- 266, 270–273, 275–276,
282, 299–300, 324–325,
407
 - associated 147, 195
 - isolated 147
 - special 146–147, 195
 - imagination 10, 13–14, 39, 60,
66, 234, 236, 241–242,
259–261, 265, 273, 281–284,
289–299, 306, 314
 - false 14, 234, 236, 242,
281–282, 283, 289, 314
 - immaculateness 315, 124–127,
148, 228, 244–246, 251,
255, 259, 275
 - immovable 38, 79, 316
 - impermanence 286, 291
 - imperturbability 344–345
 - impressions 10, 30
 - impurity 54, 67, 80, 82, 90, 96,
103, 108, 122, 152, 158, 209,
222, 247, 271, 291, 312, 328,
350, 355, 359
 - and purity 122, 291
 - and unwholesomeness 3
 - stage of 67
 - indication 28
 - bodily 28
 - non- 28
 - vocal 28
 - indifference 71, 82, 101, 138,
160–162, 164–165,
179–182, 191–192, 200,
206–207, 214, 249, 274
 - indolence 134–137, 177, 203,
205
 - innate 13–14, 39, 50, 52–54,
56, 80, 95, 131–132, 140,
161, 176, 188, 190–195, 205,
209, 226, 247, 265, 273, 305,
325–331, 336
 - insight 14, 30, 86, 88, 119, 131,
140, 143, 148, 159, 168,
177, 184, 186, 194, 201–202,
209, 217, 225, 249, 265,
272–274, 297, 300, 302,
304–313, 321, 323–324,
331–333, 335, 338, 349–350
 - eliminated by 194, 209, 273,
274, 310, 333, 338
 - intention 28, 101–102, 128,
199, 315, 319, 324–325, 329
 - investigation(s) 106, 133, 169,
171, 211, 282, 302–304,
317, 341, 408
 - four 302
- J**
- Jain (religion) 23
 - Jinamitra (Buddhist teacher) 1
 - Jinaputra (Buddhist teacher) 1
 - Jñānacandra (Buddhist teacher)
1
- K**
- karma 5, 9, 28, 46, 48, 65–66,
71, 78, 84–85, 94, 96–99,
109–110, 113, 118, 120,
137, 148, 160, 162, 185, 187,
191, 223, 235, 256, 263, 266
 - leading to a specific form of
rebirth 46
 - that fills out the details 46
 - karmic predispositions 12, 69,
110, 193–194
 - king 29, 121, 128, 141, 149,
301, 320–321, 335, 349
 - knowing
 - inaccurate 135–137
 - incorrect 135, 204–205
 - knowledge 13, 20, 31, 42, 79,
82, 94, 125, 130, 140–141,
143–145, 147, 154, 164,

- 167, 171, 176, 184, 217–218,
225, 235–237, 244–245,
272, 278, 282, 284–286,
288–290, 293, 298–299,
301–304, 306–321,
330–332, 334, 337–338,
347–352, 355–366
 - of achieving the task 348,
350, 352–353, 356,
361–362, 364, 366
 - analytical 316, 330, 334
 - conventional 42
 - correct 217–218, 237–290,
309
 - of dharmas 308, 330–331
 - four kinds of 235–236,
348–350, 359–362
 - imageless 278, 318
 - of images of different
consciousnesses 235
 - inferior 303, 358
 - internal 308
 - means of 144–145, 164, 284,
402
 - mirror 82, 125, 142, 244, 347,
349, 351–352, 361–363, 365
 - nondiscriminating 286, 307,
313–314, 316, 320,
337–338
 - nondiscriminative 235, 404
 - patience regarding of dharma
vis-à-vis 309
 - of perfecting the work 154,
184
 - pure subsequently acquired
284
 - regarding dharmas vis-à-vis
suffering 309
 - of sameness 125, 130, 141,
143, 348–349, 351, 353,
357, 361–363, 365
 - of species 308–309
 - of species vis-à-vis suffering
309
 - subsequently acquired 217,
225, 284–286, 307–308,
310–312, 317, 320, 351–352
 - that has substance as an
object 20
 - superior 79, 304
 - three kinds of 337
 - of true no self 140
 - true suchness that is the
support of mastery of 334
 - two kinds of superior 79
 - of wonderful observation
348, 350, 352, 356, 361
 - Kṣudravastuśāstra* (text) 205
 - K'uei-chi (Buddhist teacher) 2,
6, 389
- ## L
- land(s) 64, 247, 283, 311, 329,
334, 347–348, 351–352,
356–357, 359, 361, 365–367
 - bodies and 247, 283, 347,
351, 366–367
 - immaculate 365
 - pure 352, 361, 365
 - language 29, 38, 330
 - Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* 50, 64, 86,
145, 218, 231, 234
 - learner 81, 110, 143, 148, 152,
159, 172, 184, 194, 209, 217,
224, 272, 342
 - learning 78–81, 90, 93, 217,
317, 320–322
 - threefold 320
 - liberation 11, 151, 157, 172,
178, 187, 193, 217, 235, 250,
277, 292, 297–298, 302,
308–310, 315, 323, 333,
340, 349, 358, 360, 369

Index

body of 315, 358
path of 323, 340, 349
three doors to 292
life/lives 31, 46, 89, 94, 97–98,
100, 102–105, 150, 155, 179,
198, 223–224, 264, 266, 268,
272–273, 276–279, 406
and heat 31, 97–98
past 46
present 155, 223–224, 266
light emission 315
lightning 90, 94, 97
location 21, 28, 37, 60, 82, 399,
401
Lokāyatika (school) 21
love 89–90, 132, 137, 193, 194,
327
of *ālaya* 89
for *samādhi* 327
for the Dharma 327

M

Madhyāntavibhāga (text) 66,
236, 290
Mahākatyāyana 406
Mahāsāṃghika (school) 65, 88,
92, 150
Mahat 16–17, 85
Mahayana 4, 77–79, 87–88,
93, 140, 145, 148, 193, 219,
226, 245, 297, 320,
336–337, 361, 391
Mahāyāna-abhidharma Sūtra
83
Mahāyānaśaṃgraha (text) 52,
54, 115, 126, 152, 283, 336
Mahāyāna Sūtrālaṃkāra (text)
154, 218, 351, 352, 362
Maheśvara (god) 245
Mahīśāsaka (school) 89
Maitreya (Buddha) 40, 87, 236,

238
manas 39, 45, 69, 83, 99,
113–119, 122, 125,
128–153, 158, 160–161, 163,
172, 190, 206, 215,
226–227, 247, 282, 300, 350
defiled 125, 137, 139,
141–142, 145–147, 149–151
name of 113, 130
object of 128–129
soiled 122
support of 83
mantra 80
mark(s) 291, 303, 365
fundamental 365
secondary 365
material factor 221
maturation 32, 49, 64, 66,
365–366, 392–393
of causes 32, 365–366
means of conversion 301
memory 72, 82, 135–137, 148,
158, 167–171, 179, 181,
200, 203–204, 207, 249,
326, 403, 405
mental activity(ies) 15, 21, 27,
29, 32, 37, 59, 67, 70–72,
74, 82, 104–109, 121,
126–127, 134–136,
158–159, 165–169,
172–175, 181, 202, 206,
211, 215, 221, 223–224, 228,
233–234, 236, 240, 243–244,
251, 261, 264, 283, 293, 352,
391
good 82, 172, 180, 183
indeterminate 159
nine 132
twenty-one 82, 138
universal 68, 107, 158, 165,
168, 172
mental construct 373–374,

387–388
 mental discourse 211
 metaphor 9–10, 42, 77, 287
 Middle Way 77, 187, 234,
 236–237
 Mīmāṃsaka (school) 21
 mind 10, 12–15, 21, 24, 27–33,
 35–41, 50, 52–54, 57,
 61–64, 66, 68–69, 71–73,
 81–82, 89–100, 102–103,
 105–111, 114–117,
 121–127, 129, 131–140,
 143–146, 148–152, 154,
 157–171, 173–176,
 178–180, 182–183, 185,
 190, 194, 197–207,
 210–211, 216–219,
 221–228, 231, 234–236,
 239, 244–246, 251, 261,
 263–265, 276, 282–289, 291,
 293, 299–303, 305–306, 317,
 325, 332, 335, 342, 347–353,
 355, 358–359, 362–364,
 369–370
 forces not associated with 29
 minister 121
 mode 60–62, 64, 67, 71, 73,
 98–99, 105, 127, 130, 132,
 135, 155, 186, 189, 200–201,
 204–209, 211, 215–216, 220,
 231, 248, 257–258, 272, 284,
 315, 347, 351
 moment 30, 34, 56, 58–59, 78,
 81, 92, 98–99, 101, 115,
 123–124, 126–127, 133, 141,
 149, 156, 175, 204, 250,
 307–311, 323, 333, 340, 403
 moon 25, 286
 second 25
 moral precept 312, 316–317,
 320–322, 325
 motion 18, 252, 257, 318

mundane path 110, 182, 338
muni 315

N

Nālandā (Buddhist university)
 1
 name-and-form 100, 110, 267
 Nanda (Buddhist teacher) 1, 2,
 50, 73–74, 79–80, 99, 114,
 116, 123, 125, 128, 281, 306
 nature 10, 18–20, 22–23,
 27–28, 32–33, 36–38, 40,
 45, 48, 49–54, 56–58, 60,
 63, 65, 68–73, 75, 82–83,
 85, 88, 91–93, 102–103,
 108, 111, 115, 120, 130,
 134–135, 137–139, 142,
 145–147, 151, 155–157, 159,
 161, 165, 167–168, 171–181,
 183, 185–186, 192,
 196–205, 208, 210–212,
 215, 218–219, 225, 228,
 231, 234, 236–237, 240–243,
 248–251, 255, 264, 271,
 273–274, 278, 281–299,
 301, 303–304, 306–307,
 310–312, 314–317, 321, 323,
 327, 335, 338–339, 341,
 343–344, 347, 350, 355–356,
 358–360, 362, 365–367,
 369–370, 397–398, 401, 406
 dependent on others 85, 237,
 283–293, 295–296, 338,
 364, 369
 of dharmas 38, 286
 of existence 19, 22–23
 imagined 234, 281–282,
 287–288, 291–293
 of things 38, 50–51, 54, 366
 perfected 283, 285, 287–288,
 291–294, 296, 314

Index

three 85, 134, 151, 156–157,
 215, 281, 287–288,
 290–295
 naturelessness 294–296
 negligence 178, 203
 neither learner nor post-learner
 184, 194, 209, 224
nirvāṇa 13, 15, 50–51, 55–66,
 72, 81–87, 93–94, 103, 108,
 110–111, 150, 187, 224,
 227, 244, 277, 293, 299,
 314, 319, 327, 331, 337,
 340–345, 348, 353, 357, 359
 nonabiding 344
parinirvāṇa 327
 that is intrinsically pure by
 nature 341
 with no fixed abode 319, 342,
 348
 with remaining support 341
 without remainder 81–82,
 110, 277, 342–343
 nonacquisition 29–30
 nonconceptualization 106, 109,
 149, 222
 noncraving 175–180, 185
 nondelusion 175–177, 180,
 185, 202, 211, 282, 300
 nonharming 176, 179–182
 nonhatred 175–176, 179–180,
 185, 317
 nonobstruction 252
 nonreturner 225–226, 269, 272
 nutriment(s) 69, 101–103
 four 102–103

O

object(s) 10, 13–14, 17, 20,
 22–26, 29, 32, 36, 39–42,
 45, 47, 49, 60–68, 70–74,
 76, 82, 86, 89–91, 97–102,

105, 107, 111, 114, 116,
 119, 121–125, 128–131,
 133–139, 143, 145, 148, 151,
 153–159, 162–172,
 174–176, 179–182, 184,
 187, 189–194, 196–198,
 200–204, 207–209, 211,
 214–216, 225, 228–229,
 231, 234–239, 246–248,
 255, 259–261, 265, 268–270,
 273, 275, 278, 282–286,
 288, 293, 299, 303–304,
 306–308, 310–312,
 320–321, 333, 337, 347,
 350–352, 356–357, 359, 369
 apparent tangible 396
 of attachment 47
 common 121–122, 129
 contemplated 167, 169
 dream 211, 235, 237, 403
 external 10, 39, 41, 62, 129,
 133, 135, 163, 234, 237–239,
 247, 333, 369, 391–392,
 398–399, 402–405, 407
 four kinds of 169–170
 internal 67, 135, 247, 369
 material 116, 164, 239
 of perception 61, 63, 65, 70,
 72, 247, 391–393, 396,
 398–399, 401–405,
 407–408
 perceptual 65, 67, 148, 171
 sense 154
 six kinds of 154
 special 72, 82, 194, 398
 specific 134, 136, 137–138,
 158–159, 169–172, 181,
 184, 192, 207, 215, 308, 379
 supporting 107
 obstacle(s) 51, 55, 73, 78–79,
 82, 86, 134, 138, 140, 144,
 167, 179, 256, 276–278, 290,

298–301, 305, 307–308,
313–315, 318, 323–333,
335–337, 339–345, 347,
349, 352, 360, 362
of the activity of coarse
characteristics 328
of the activity of subtle
characteristics 328
of the activity of the subtle
passion 326
to *bodhi* 345
consisting of the quality of
being an ordinary 324
of passion 7, 79
subtle 326
ten 318, 324
to that which is to be known
51, 55, 78, 144, 276–278,
290, 299–300, 314,
325–326, 327–333, 337,
342, 344–345, 347
two 5, 55, 276, 278, 290,
300–301, 307, 313–314,
318, 323–324, 327–328,
331–332, 335–337,
339–340, 345, 360, 362
obstruction 252, 348
ocean 86, 228, 369
old age and death 268, 270,
274–275
once returner 9
oneness 231
of subject and object 231
organ 17–18, 21, 25, 42, 60, 66,
68, 74, 81, 83, 86, 90–92,
96–97, 104–105, 115–123,
128–129, 148, 152–155, 162,
165, 167, 220, 228–229, 246,
251, 269–270, 350, 352,
356–357, 359, 364, 402
bodily 18
impure 246, 350

material 18, 21, 66, 81, 83,
86, 97, 117–121, 129, 154,
246, 364
mental 128
physical 22, 60
sense 17, 22, 66, 90, 96,
104–105, 123, 154
sex 162
six 152–153, 251
visual 74, 116, 117, 155
other shore 318
outflow 140, 334
pure 140
true suchness that is the
supreme 334

P

part 10, 21–22, 26, 39, 48–49,
55, 60–64, 67, 84, 89, 100,
104, 117, 122, 128–129,
151, 155, 157, 161, 165,
174, 190, 193, 196–201,
203–205, 207, 209, 211, 213,
227, 229, 233, 236–238, 240,
242–243, 246–248, 260,
263, 269–270, 272–275, 278,
283–286, 289–299, 306–312,
316, 325–330, 348, 364,
369–370
seeing 26, 49, 61–64, 117,
129, 151, 155, 233, 236,
242, 247, 260, 284, 286,
289, 306–310, 348, 369
seen 49, 61–63, 67, 117, 151,
196, 233, 238, 246, 260,
283–284, 289, 307, 348,
364, 369–370
self-authenticating 62, 307,
309
passion(s) 15, 36, 51, 53, 78–80,
88, 109–111, 131–141,

Index

- 144–148, 151–152,
- 158–161, 176–177, 182,
- 185–186, 188, 190–196,
- 200–212, 215, 218, 221,
- 225–226, 266, 270, 271,
- 273–277, 290, 292, 293,
- 299–300, 309, 314–316,
- 318–319, 322–327, 329,
- 331–333, 336–337,
- 341–345, 356, 360, 369
- four fundamental 131
- subtle 326
- ten 136, 147, 188, 190, 192,
- 194, 207, 215
- path(s) 14, 28, 30–31, 55, 73,
- 75, 83–86, 94–96, 110–111,
- 119, 123, 138–143, 148,
- 157, 159, 168, 177, 179, 182,
- 184, 186–188, 193–196,
- 198, 209, 217, 224–225, 241,
- 249, 256, 265, 272–273, 277,
- 284, 288, 292–293, 296–297,
- 300, 302–313, 316, 318, 321,
- 323, 325, 327–329, 331–333,
- 335, 337–341, 347, 349–350,
- 355, 359, 367
- aspects of the 168
- of added effort 312
- bodhisattva 318
- to cessation 85
- of cultivation 14, 143, 186,
- 194–195, 297, 325, 332–333,
- 338, 350
- of elimination 338
- and forms of rebirth 95–96
- holy 55, 73, 86, 138,
- 140–143, 293, 300,
- 338–339, 341, 347
- impure 139, 193, 300, 337
- of insight 14, 30, 86, 119,
- 143, 168, 186, 194, 249, 297,
- 302, 304–305, 307–310,
- 312–313, 321, 323–324,
- 331–333, 335, 349
- of insight of characteristics
308–310, 312
- of insight of reality 308, 310
- of liberation 323, 340, 349
- mundane 110, 182, 338
- of noninterruption 323,
- 339–340, 349
- of promotion 318
- pure 110, 139, 193, 217, 256,
- 300, 327, 329, 337
- supramundane 110, 139,
- 182, 338
- truth of the 157, 224, 277,
- 284, 292, 355, 367
- two 311–312, 323, 337
- patience 249, 293, 302, 304,
- 309–310, 316–317
- perception 9, 14–18, 20, 25,
- 60–65, 67, 70, 72, 154–155,
- 165, 171, 220, 235, 238,
- 247, 347
- direct 16–18, 20, 25, 63, 238,
- 402–403
- of object 155
- perfection(s) 301–302,
- 316–323, 336
- of giving 302
- six 301
- ten 316–317, 319, 321, 323
- perfumable 58–59, 72–73,
- 91–93, 349
- seeds 349
- perfuming 13, 15–16, 32, 39,
- 41, 45, 49–52, 54, 58–60,
- 73–75, 91–93, 105,
- 109–110, 117, 120–121,
- 150, 152, 231, 238, 242, 251,
- 257, 263, 265, 267, 283–284,
- 297, 299, 370, 395
- false 13, 16, 39, 283

foundation that is 257
 by hearing 54
 power of 15, 49, 238, 284,
 370
 three 242
 permanence 76–77
 non- 76
 pleasure 11, 28, 38, 71, 78, 89,
 101, 124, 159–164, 208,
 274
 poison 80, 392
 post-learner 29, 90, 110–111,
 139–140, 142, 152, 159, 172,
 184, 194, 209, 217, 224–225,
 250, 272, 277, 333, 342, 350
 power(s) 9–10, 13–15, 20–21,
 24–25, 29, 32, 34, 38–39,
 45, 49, 56, 57, 59–60, 64,
 66, 68, 71, 74, 91, 100–101,
 107–108, 111, 114, 117, 119,
 123–124, 126, 138, 140,
 166–168, 171, 174, 176, 178,
 185, 188, 203–205, 209, 217,
 219, 221–224, 226, 228, 238,
 242, 245, 247–248, 252, 259,
 263, 270, 276–279, 284, 289,
 298, 300–301, 308, 317, 319,
 321–322, 331–332, 335,
 337–338, 343, 345, 347–348,
 352, 355, 359–361, 363,
 365–366, 370, 393–395,
 404–406
 boundless 360
 of impressions 10
 of mutual influence 242
 of *samādhi* 66, 138, 343
 special 176, 252
 supernatural 331, 335, 361,
 405
 practice 11, 72, 77, 79, 94, 149,
 177, 187–188, 224, 277,
 299, 301, 315–316, 318,

 320, 323, 327, 329–330,
 335–336, 338, 358, 365
 of the Middle Way 187
 superior 301, 315–316, 329,
 335–336
Pramāṇasamuccaya (text) 62
pratyekabuddha (self-taught
 Buddha) 51, 55, 78, 82,
 143, 276–277
 presence 39, 51, 55, 122, 124,
 131, 137, 147, 183, 190, 201,
 228, 316, 331
 pride 131, 146, 181, 189–195,
 207–208, 299–300
 promotion 152, 252, 257, 318
 foundation consisting of 252,
 257
 proof 29–31, 33, 35, 50, 83, 144,
 152, 165, 168, 234, 236, 402
 propensities 36, 151, 212,
 225–226, 299–301, 305,
 307–310, 313, 325,
 337–338, 355
 purgatory(ies) 50–51, 124,
 161–163, 193

Q

qualities 16, 18, 20, 22, 41–42,
 72, 334–335, 341, 347–348,
 350, 355–357, 360–365
 three 16, 22

R

rajas 16
 reality 14, 18, 23–24, 28, 30,
 38, 40, 42, 49, 54, 65, 86, 129,
 142, 144, 146–147, 173,
 187, 191, 194, 202, 233–234,
 237, 240, 248, 275, 282–283,
 285–288, 290, 296, 298,
 303–304, 307–310, 312,

Index

- 323, 325, 333, 342, 356, 369,
391, 393, 401, 404–405, 407
- true 14, 248
- ultimate 38, 49, 54, 65, 240,
285–286
- realm(s) 10, 13, 15, 31–32, 39,
40–41, 48, 51, 61, 64–67, 70,
75, 82, 88, 94–96, 98–99,
101–103, 109–110, 116–123,
132, 136, 138–139, 150, 156,
160–163, 172, 175, 183–185,
191–193, 208, 214–216,
220–226, 228, 234, 243–246,
251–252, 255, 260–261,
265, 268–269, 272–273,
276, 278, 283, 285, 296–297,
300, 306, 309, 312, 329, 333,
341, 355–356, 358–361,
391–392, 394, 408
- of desire 67, 99, 101–102,
117–118, 139, 160,
183–184, 191–193, 208,
223, 225–226, 245, 306
- of the Dharma 51, 296–297,
312, 341, 355–356, 358–361
- of form 65, 67, 99, 103, 117,
121–122, 223, 245–246
- formless 32, 65, 67, 74, 89,
95–96, 99, 103, 245, 269
- objective 61, 67, 70, 123,
255, 283, 392
- rebirth 46, 65, 72, 75, 81, 86,
95–96, 98, 110, 185, 193,
208, 246, 268–271, 276
- death and 81, 185, 271
- paths and forms of 95–96
- receptacle 60–61, 65–67,
83–84, 94, 119
- world 60–61, 65–67, 83, 94,
119
- recollection 14–15, 62, 133,
137, 167, 169, 171
- redness 41
- reeds 52, 60, 100, 115
- regression(s) 63, 226, 301, 312
- infinite 63
- three 301
- regret 133–134, 216, 249
- remorse 133, 197, 210–217
- replica 68
- resolve 72, 82, 111, 130, 133,
158, 167, 169–174, 181, 192,
202, 301, 306, 317, 335, 350
- restriction 391–393, 404
- result(s) 10–12, 15–16, 18,
21–22, 27, 30–32, 39, 45,
48–52, 54–57, 60, 62, 64, 66,
69–71, 73, 75–77, 80–81,
84–85, 91, 94, 96–99, 104,
108–111, 115, 120,
123–125, 132–133, 135, 144,
147, 151–152, 158–159,
166–167, 177, 183, 185,
190–191, 195, 200,
202–203, 210, 218, 220,
222–224, 226, 233–234,
236, 240–242, 251–259,
261, 263–273, 276–279,
281, 292, 298, 302, 314, 320,
322, 324, 330, 332–333,
335–336, 338, 341, 343, 345,
347–350, 353, 355, 358–361,
393, 395, 400, 402, 405–406
- of action 11
- of karma 94
- of perfuming 50–52, 54
- of similar species 46
- of similarity 31
- of the operations of the
person 257–258
- as retribution 264–265,
267–268, 272, 276
- that is similar 257–258
- six 74

- retribution 28, 32, 45–46,
48–49, 51–52, 55, 58–59,
61, 64–67, 71–73, 79,
81–82, 94–98, 100,
103–104, 113, 116, 118,
120–121, 125, 132, 139,
143–144, 161–163, 176,
216, 222–223, 228, 241,
246, 253, 256–258,
263–265, 267–268, 271,
276–279, 299–300, 320,
343, 349–350, 405
born of 46, 49, 94, 97, 144,
216, 222, 256, 300
cause as 257
energy of 45
fruit of 28, 48, 52, 144
habit energy of 45–46
mind as 94–97, 100, 125
results as 264–265,
267–268, 272, 276
results of 46, 48, 71, 278
seeds of 49
root(s) 88, 90, 108–109, 122,
166, 175–179, 182, 186, 203,
220, 241–243, 248–250,
259, 263, 267, 279, 297,
305, 310, 312–314, 324,
335, 338–339, 365
three 175, 177–179, 182,
203
- S**
saint 78, 81, 148, 186, 224,
227, 272, 278, 323, 341, 359
sainthood 30
Śākyamuni (Buddha) 208
samādhi 5, 28, 32, 66–67, 70,
82, 90, 92, 95, 98–99,
102–105, 107–109, 122,
133–136, 138–143, 149,
156–158, 167–171, 178–179,
181, 183, 192–193,
203–204, 207–208, 210, 216,
221–227, 235, 250, 271,
274, 276–278, 303–304,
315, 317, 319–322, 324,
326–327, 331–333,
335–336, 339–340, 343,
348–350, 356
of cessation 67, 90, 103, 105,
109, 122, 139–143, 224,
226–227
mindless 98, 108
non- 183
of nonconceptualization 106,
109, 149
pure 276–278
superior 235, 271, 277, 315,
326
two 32, 149, 222
unconscious 102, 105, 222
samanantara 115, 126, 261,
275
Samdhinirmocana Sūtra 86,
234, 319
Saṃghabhadra (Buddhist
teacher) 70
Sāṃkhyas (school) 16, 18, 22,
53, 85
saṃsāra 72, 83–84, 87, 89, 94,
223, 239–240, 263, 314,
319, 328, 337, 339, 340,
342–344, 357, 369
long night of 239
Sarvāstivādin (school) 29–35,
76, 89, 93, 102, 104, 111,
150, 166, 243, 323
satkāya-dṛṣṭi 299
Sautrāntika (school) 25, 78,
90–91, 105, 107–108
Savitarkabhūmi (chapter of the
Yogācārabhūmi Śāstra)

Index

- 253–254
- scale 76, 323
- secondary passions 133–137,
 - 146, 148, 159, 185, 196,
 - 205–209, 211–212, 215, 299
- eight 137
- large 197, 215
- medium 197
- six 134, 135
- small 197
- ten 134, 136
- twenty 158, 205, 210
- seed(s) 15, 28, 30, 32, 46–60,
 - 64–67, 69, 73–75, 78–79,
 - 81, 83, 85–86, 90–94, 96,
 - 102–103, 105, 109–111,
 - 114–122, 129, 139–140,
 - 144–145, 150–152, 157, 213,
 - 219, 225–228, 241–244,
 - 247, 249, 251–256, 259–261,
 - 264–269, 271, 275,
 - 278–279, 282–284, 297,
 - 299–300, 305, 313, 321–324,
 - 331–333, 335–340,
 - 347–352, 356, 359, 396
- common 64, 66, 242
- external 51, 58, 251
- fertilized 251, 255
- generating 253
- holder of all 48
- impure 46, 49–52, 65–67,
 - 103, 279, 335, 351, 356
- internal 50, 54, 57–58, 91,
 - 213
- mundane 110
- origin of 49
- productive 253–254
- projecting 253
- pure 50–51, 53–55, 91, 93,
 - 111, 242, 279, 339, 349,
 - 352, 356
- sesame 50, 91
- six different 74
- soiled 151, 152
- self 10–20, 22, 38, 40, 47,
 - 62–63, 66, 70–71, 79–81,
 - 85–86, 88–90, 129–134,
 - 136–139, 142–146,
 - 150–152, 155, 175–176,
 - 186, 188–195, 200–201,
 - 218–219, 231, 233, 234,
 - 236, 239, 242, 249–250,
 - 260, 264–265, 273, 282,
 - 285–287, 291–292, 295,
 - 299, 307, 309, 321, 324,
 - 326–327, 334, 336, 339,
 - 351, 364–365
- absence of 38, 130, 397, 398
- authentication 62–63, 70
- attachment 150–151
- conceit 131
- delusion about 131, 145
- inner 47, 71, 79–81, 89–90,
 - 130, 132, 138–139, 151
- existence 91
- love 79–81, 90, 131,
 - 145–146, 189
- nature 18–20, 40, 56, 70,
 - 85, 130, 146, 155, 176, 201,
 - 219, 234, 242, 249–250,
 - 273, 292, 295
- pride 146, 180, 186, 189
- real 10, 12–16, 89, 299
- view of 13, 79–80, 131, 146,
 - 192, 194, 327
- selfhood 89, 142–143
 - of dharmas 142–143
- selflessness 142
 - no self 13–14, 18, 56, 87,
 - 90–91, 131, 140, 146,
 - 150–151, 180, 195, 286,
 - 288, 291
- sense 9, 11, 17–19, 22, 25, 29,
 - 36, 39–40, 51, 56, 66–67,

- 74, 85, 90, 92, 96, 101, 102,
104–105, 107–108, 114,
116–118, 121, 123, 146,
148–149, 153–154,
159–160, 162–164, 168,
172, 174, 177, 182, 212,
227–228, 237–238,
257–258, 267, 269–270,
281, 295, 342, 351–352,
356–358, 367, 395–398
- base(s) 9, 36, 39–40, 51, 66,
101–102, 114, 116–118,
121, 148, 227, 237, 238,
267, 269–270, 281, 295,
351, 356–358, 367,
395–398
- base for dharmas 66
- base of form 101
- base of tangibility 227
- faculties 17
- field(s) 9, 36, 39, 51, 102, 117,
267, 281, 295, 356–359, 367
- serenity 178, 182–184,
201–202, 215
- shame 72, 135, 174–176, 182,
199, 335
- shamelessness 135, 155, 174,
197, 200, 205
- signlessness 292
- similar/similarity 19, 23, 25,
30–31, 45, 50, 52, 56,
60–62, 64, 68, 70–71, 73,
74, 109, 114–115, 123–127,
149, 153, 196, 213, 219–220,
228, 229, 241, 244–246,
251, 255–259, 264, 275, 367
- simultaneity 115, 152, 163,
227, 267, 323
- skill in means 305, 317, 319
- sloth 210–217, 226–227
- solidity 18, 33
- son of a stone woman 19
- sorrow 160–163, 172, 184,
190–192, 206–207, 214,
217, 250
faculty of 161–162, 172
- sovereign 30, 121, 125, 127,
206, 215
- space 11–12, 15, 20, 27, 37–38,
61, 67, 74, 97, 102, 110, 168,
285, 287, 295, 316, 341, 348,
362, 365, 401
- species 41–42, 45, 56–57, 60,
71, 90–93, 96, 98, 110, 115,
125–127, 138, 155, 157, 171,
182, 184, 205, 211–213,
215, 220, 228–229,
243–244, 246, 252, 254,
256, 259, 308–310,
333–334, 350, 357–358,
361–362, 364, 393, 406
- different 110, 126, 243
- moral 57, 90, 138, 155, 157,
358
- previous 125
- same 57, 60, 92, 115, 127,
182, 205, 229, 243–244,
252, 256, 259, 357
- single 56, 71, 91, 96, 98
- speech 31, 35, 103, 106, 133,
135, 154, 158, 217, 250,
317, 325, 335, 348, 352,
363–364, 405
- sprout 74, 115, 148, 270
- Śrisena (Buddhist teacher) 50
- stage(s) 29–30, 32, 39–40, 48,
53–54, 56, 66–68, 78–81,
84, 90, 93, 102, 106,
109–110, 117–118, 123,
130, 138–139, 143–144, 149,
159, 163, 170–171, 179,
183–184, 191, 193–194,
196, 208, 210, 213, 216–217,
221–227, 243–246, 250,

Index

- 270, 271–272, 276, 298,
300–301, 306, 308–310,
312–313, 315–316, 318,
321–333, 335–336,
348–350, 361, 365–366, 403
- of cultivation 55
- of equipment 32, 298
- of impurity 67
- mindless 221
- of ordinary beings 30, 53
- of post-learner 250
- of resolve and application
301, 306, 350
- ten bodhisattva 39–40
- ten 80, 245, 313, 315–316,
318, 323, 325, 332–333,
335–336, 349–350, 361,
365
- state(s) 15, 26, 29–32, 34,
36–37, 40, 48, 61, 68,
75–77, 80–82, 89, 91–92,
95, 98, 100, 102, 104–109,
121–122, 125, 127, 133–134,
137–140, 142–143, 150, 155,
157, 160, 163–164, 168–170,
182–183, 191, 193, 196,
205, 210–211, 214–219,
221–223, 226–228,
239–240, 242, 245, 246,
248–249, 251, 253, 267–272,
274, 282, 291, 293,
296–298, 300–307, 313,
315, 317, 321–323, 325,
327, 332–333, 335–338,
340, 343, 349–350, 353,
355, 393, 403–405
- of added effort 169, 249,
297–298, 302, 305
- of culmination 297–298,
322, 336, 355
- of cultivation 297–298, 313,
315, 321, 322, 336, 353, 355
- embryonic 100
- of equipment 249, 297, 300,
321
- root 249
- Sthavira (school) 77, 88, 93,
103
- Sthiramati (Buddhist teacher)
1–2, 49, 117–121, 123, 129,
140, 169, 282–283, 306
- stream 75–80, 86–87, 273
- of dharma 77
- winner 9, 80
- stupefaction 226–227
- Śubhakarṣṇa (realm) 222
- substance 9–11, 15–23, 25–26,
29, 31, 33, 35–37, 41–42,
45, 48–50, 53–54, 56,
60–64, 73, 76–78, 81–83,
85, 89–90, 94–95, 100–103,
105, 128, 143–144, 149, 171,
176, 178–181, 186, 196–201,
203–204, 209–211, 213,
227, 229, 238, 241–242,
246, 249, 260, 283–285, 289,
293–295, 300, 307, 311, 313,
321, 326, 341, 351, 357, 360,
363, 365–366, 398–399
- suchness(es) 130, 287–290,
292–293, 296, 301,
305–309, 311, 313–315,
318, 334–339, 341–345,
351, 361, 369–370
- ten true 334
- true 130, 287–288, 292–293,
296, 301, 305–308, 311,
313–315, 318, 334–336,
370, 337–339, 341–345,
351, 361, 369
- unappropriated true 334
- universal true 334
- Śuddhacandra (Buddhist
teacher) 1, 120

- Śuddhavāsika (realm) 245
 suffering 15, 85, 89, 94, 96,
 136, 155, 159–164, 172,
 174–175, 179, 184–187,
 190–191, 195, 197, 206,
 214–215, 266, 270, 272,
 274–275, 277, 288, 291,
 293, 296, 309, 314, 317,
 324, 336, 341–343, 356,
 359, 367, 393–394
 of deterioration 274
 faculty of 160–163, 172, 324
 feeling of 159, 172, 190–191,
 206, 215, 274
 subtle 341
 of suffering 274
 support of 342–343
 unadulterated 163, 191, 214,
 215
 summit 249, 302–304
 summoning 244, 258, 264–266
 birth 264
 the dominant result 258
 nonpleasurable results 265
 pleasurable results 265
 subsequent existences 266
 superimposition 42
 support 10, 24–25, 32, 36, 42,
 49–50, 52, 60–62, 65–66,
 68–69, 71–74, 78, 81,
 83–86, 88, 91, 94, 96–100,
 102–103, 110–111,
 114–123, 125–130,
 138–144, 146, 148–149,
 151–156, 166, 168, 170,
 178, 182, 185–187, 195, 199,
 202–203, 208, 211, 220, 224,
 227–229, 231, 233, 243,
 246–248, 267, 270, 274,
 278–279, 286, 291, 300, 302,
 305, 311, 313–316,
 318–319, 321, 326–327,
 332, 334–336, 338–343,
 347–350, 353, 355,
 358–360, 362, 364–366
 of consciousness 74, 151
 of dharmas 81
 of feeling 69
 initiating and guiding 123,
 125–128
 of the knowable 81
 remaining 341–343
 simultaneous 84, 114, 116,
 119–122, 142, 148
 supramundane 54, 81, 110,
 139, 141, 173, 178, 182,
 312, 321, 327, 338, 355, 404
 dharma 55
 thought 54
Sutra of Birth and Extinction
 69
- T**
tamas 16
 thirst 172, 185, 198–199, 208,
 221, 268–275
Thirty Verses 9, 45, 47, 64, 68,
 139–140, 165, 180, 205, 370
 thought
 applied 210–218
 applied and sustained 123,
 133, 161, 163, 181, 183, 214
 thoughtlessness 134–137
 Three Treatise School 356
 torch 12, 115
 torpor 133–137, 178, 201–202,
 205–206
 trance state 31, 89, 138, 160,
 163, 191, 193, 214–216,
 222–223, 272, 305, 317,
 321–322, 327
 tranquility 60, 200–201, 210,
 301, 310, 344–345

Index

and insight 301, 310
perfect 344–345
transformation 9, 24–27, 37,
42–43, 45, 61, 65–66, 68,
119, 154, 233–234,
237–240, 242–243,
247–248, 276–278, 284,
286–287, 303, 348, 350,
352–353, 356–357, 359,
360–364, 366–367,
395–396, 404–406
as cause 45
as result 45
transgression 79–80, 82,
199–200, 299
transmigration 84, 87, 240,
288
transmutation 86, 111, 127,
130–131, 138–139, 141,
155–156, 170, 247–248,
302, 313–315, 332,
335–340, 347–348, 353,
355, 357–360, 362–363
as abandonment 314
as acquisition 314
of cultivation 336
great 337
inferior 336
of the perfection of result
336
of the support 86, 111, 127,
130, 139, 155–156, 170,
247–248, 302, 313–315,
332, 335–336, 347, 353,
355, 358
of thorough understanding
335–336
twofold 315, 335
Trimsikā-vijñaptimātratā (text)
1
truth(s) 10, 32, 49, 76, 85, 87,
96, 115, 124, 151, 157, 168,

174, 186, 188, 191,
194–196, 208–209, 219,
224, 231, 235–236, 238,
249, 272, 274–275, 277,
284, 286, 288, 290–296,
298, 304–310, 312, 320,
337–338, 343, 355, 359, 367
of cessation 85, 292
nonestablished 305, 308
of origination 291
of the path 157, 224, 277,
284, 292, 355, 367
relative 238
of suffering 195, 274–275,
291, 309
two 174, 238, 293
ultimate 10, 49, 115, 219,
231, 238, 293–296, 298,
304, 306
worldly 49

U

Udāyi Sūtra 224
undefiled 73, 141–142, 144,
151, 182, 212, 272
understanding 23, 86, 140,
204, 216, 223–224, 239,
270, 297–298, 306–307,
321–322, 335–336
correct 7–8
thorough 297–298, 306–307,
321–322, 335–336
ungraspable 237
uninterrupted 86, 97, 177,
308–310, 330, 347, 359
union 19, 56, 58–59, 63,
68–70, 107–108, 136,
164–166, 252, 291, 399
universals 135–136, 138, 157,
159, 165, 167–169
ten 135

two 136
 unveiled 72–73
 indeterminate and 72

V

Vaiśeṣika (school) 18–19, 22,
 41, 398
 vanity 206–208
 Vasubandhu (Buddhist teacher)
 1–2, 7, 60, 67–68, 71,
 73–74, 76, 81, 116, 128,
 130–133, 139, 153, 155,
 157, 172, 185, 196, 210, 212,
 219, 221, 227, 233, 241,
 263, 278, 281, 294, 298,
 302, 306, 313, 337, 353,
 355, 370
 Vedas (texts) 21
 vehicle(s) 16, 25, 47, 55, 60,
 78–79, 81, 87–88, 93, 111,
 126, 139–140, 142–144,
 177, 181, 225–226, 245,
 249, 252, 261, 271,
 277–278, 300, 305,
 315–316, 320, 323–325,
 327, 332–333, 336,
 342–343, 350, 355,
 357–358, 360–361
 three 78, 111, 139–140, 225,
 332–333
 two 55, 81, 87, 93, 140,
 142–144, 177, 245, 249,
 277–278, 300, 305,
 315–316, 320, 323–325,
 333, 342–343, 350,
 357–358, 360–361
 veiled 72–73
 indeterminate and 72
 vexation 162, 197, 318
 Vibhajyavādin (school) 53, 88
 view(s) 10, 13–14, 21, 49,

237, 243, 250–251, 257,
 298–299, 300, 322,
 326–327, 400
 false 94, 185, 188–189,
 191–192, 195, 207, 216
 perverted 13
 of real personhood 299
 true 251, 257, 298
 wrong 131, 186–191,
 194–195, 208, 217
 vigilance 178–179, 181–182,
 203
 vigor 177–179, 182, 202,
 203, 317–319, 322
Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa Sūtra
 234
Vimokṣa Sūtra 145
Viniścayasamgraha (text)
 49, 78–79, 183, 222
Viniścayasamgrahanī (text)
 183, 222
 visible 18, 35, 66, 399, 402
 vital principle 31, 48, 228
 volition 14, 28, 68–69, 71,
 73, 106–108, 132, 158,
 165, 211–212, 216,
 222–223, 263
 vow(s) 28, 125, 245,
 276–279, 317, 319, 325,
 343, 348, 359, 370
 great 245, 277
 original 279, 348, 359
 power of 277
 power of great 245
 power of original 348, 359
samādhi and 276–278,
 343
Vyākhyāpana Śāstra 163

W

wholesomeness 3
 unwholesomeness 3

Index

world-conquering monarch 29
World-Honored One 51–52,
82, 86–87, 96, 103, 116,
237, 281, 294–295, 342,
360, 395, 406, 408

Y

Yoga masters 26
Yogācāra 115, 118–120, 124,
127, 129, 132, 135–136,
141, 147, 151, 156, 158,
163, 169, 175–176,
182–183, 191, 203–206,
213, 226, 244, 250, 255,
269, 273
Yogācārabhūṣmi Śāstra 69,
121, 176, 183

A List of the Volumes of the BDK English Tripiṭaka (First Series)

Abbreviations

<i>Ch.</i> :	Chinese
<i>Skt.</i> :	Sanskrit
<i>Jp.</i> :	Japanese
<i>Eng.</i> :	Published title
<i>T.</i> :	Taishō Tripiṭaka

Vol. No.	Title	T. No.
1, 2	<i>Ch.</i> Ch'ang-a-han-ching (長阿含經) <i>Skt.</i> Dirghāgama	1
3-8	<i>Ch.</i> Chung-a-han-ching (中阿含經) <i>Skt.</i> Madhyamāgama	26
9-I	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-ch'eng-pên-shêng-hsin-ti-kuan-ching (大乘本生心地觀經)	159
9-II	<i>Ch.</i> Fo-so-hsing-tsan (佛所行讚) <i>Skt.</i> Buddhacarita	192
10-I	<i>Ch.</i> Tsa-pao-ts'ang-ching (雜寶藏經) <i>Eng.</i> The Storehouse of Sundry Valuables	203
10-II	<i>Ch.</i> Fa-chü-p'î-yü-ching (法句譬喻經)	211
11-I	<i>Ch.</i> Hsiao-p'î-n-pan-jo-po-lo-mi-ching (小品般若波羅蜜經) <i>Skt.</i> Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra	227
11-II	<i>Ch.</i> Chin-kang-pan-jo-po-lo-mi-ching (金剛般若波羅蜜經) <i>Skt.</i> Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra	235

Vol. No.	Title	T. No.
11-III	<i>Ch.</i> Jên-wang-pan-jo-po-lo-mi-ching (仁王般若波羅蜜經) <i>Skt.</i> Kāruṇikārājā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra (?)	245
11-IV	<i>Ch.</i> Pan-jo-po-lo-mi-to-hsing-ching (般若波羅蜜多心經) <i>Skt.</i> Prajñāpāramitāhṛdaya-sūtra	251
12-I	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-lo-chin-kang-pu-k'ung-chên-shih-san-mo- yeh-ching (大樂金剛不空眞實三麼耶經) <i>Skt.</i> Adhyardhaśatikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra	243
12-II	<i>Ch.</i> Wu-liang-shou-ching (無量壽經) <i>Skt.</i> Sukhāvativyūha <i>Eng.</i> The Larger Sutra on Amitāyus (In The Three Pure Land Sutras)	360
12-III	<i>Ch.</i> Kuan-wu-liang-shou-fo-ching (觀無量壽佛經) <i>Skt.</i> Amitāyurdhyāna-sūtra <i>Eng.</i> The Sutra on Contemplation of Amitāyus (In The Three Pure Land Sutras)	365
12-IV	<i>Ch.</i> A-mi-t'o-ching (阿彌陀經) <i>Skt.</i> Sukhāvativyūha <i>Eng.</i> The Smaller Sutra on Amitāyus (In The Three Pure Land Sutras)	366
12-V	<i>Ch.</i> Ti-ts'ang-p'u-sa-pên-yüan-ching (地藏菩薩本願經) <i>Skt.</i> Kṣitigarbhapraṇidhāna-sūtra (?)	412
12-VI	<i>Ch.</i> Yao-shih-liu-li-kuang-ju-lai-pên-yüan-kung- tê-ching (藥師琉璃光如來本願功德經) <i>Skt.</i> Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabhāsapūrva- praṇidhānaviśeṣavistara	450
12-VII	<i>Ch.</i> Mi-lê-hsia-shêng-ch'êng-fo-ching (彌勒下生成佛經) <i>Skt.</i> Maitreyavyākaraṇa (?)	454
12-VIII	<i>Ch.</i> Wên-shu-shih-li-wên-ching (文殊師利問經) <i>Skt.</i> Mañjuśrīparipṛcchā (?)	468
13-I	<i>Ch.</i> Miao-fa-lien-hua-ching (妙法蓮華經) <i>Skt.</i> Saddharmapuṇḍarika-sūtra <i>Eng.</i> The Lotus Sutra	262
13-II	<i>Ch.</i> Wu-liang-i-ching (無量義經)	276

Vol. No.	Title	T. No.
13-III	<i>Ch.</i> Kuan-p'u-hsien-p'u-sa-hsing-fa-ching (觀普賢菩薩行法經)	277
14-19	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-fang-kuang-fo-hua-yen-ching (大方廣佛華嚴經) <i>Skt.</i> Avatamsaka-sūtra	278
20-I	<i>Ch.</i> Shêng-man-shih-tzū-hou-i-ch'eng-ta-fang-pien-fang-kuang-ching (勝鬘師子吼一乘大方便方廣經) <i>Skt.</i> Śrīmālādevisīṃhanāda-sūtra	353
20-II	<i>Ch.</i> Chin-kuang-ming-tsui-shêng-wang-ching (金光明最勝王經) <i>Skt.</i> Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra	665
21-24	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-pan-nieh-p'an-ching (大般涅槃經) <i>Skt.</i> Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra	374
25-I	<i>Ch.</i> Fo-ch'ui-pan-nieh-p'an-liao-shuo-chiao-chieh-ching (佛垂般涅槃略說教誡經)	389
25-II	<i>Ch.</i> Pan-chou-san-mei-ching (般舟三昧經) <i>Skt.</i> Pratyutpannabuddhasammukhāvasthitasamādhi-sūtra <i>Eng.</i> The Pratyutpanna Samādhi Sutra	418
25-III	<i>Ch.</i> Shou-lêng-yen-san-mei-ching (首楞嚴三昧經) <i>Skt.</i> Śūraṅgamasamādhi-sūtra <i>Eng.</i> The Śūraṅgama Samādhi Sutra	642
25-IV	<i>Ch.</i> Chieh-shên-mi-ching (解深密經) <i>Skt.</i> Saṃdhinirmocana-sūtra	676
25-V	<i>Ch.</i> Yü-lan-p'ên-ching (盂蘭盆經) <i>Skt.</i> Ullambana-sūtra (?)	685
25-VI	<i>Ch.</i> Ssü-shih-êrh-chang-ching (四十二章經)	784
26-I	<i>Ch.</i> Wei-mo-chieh-so-shuo-ching (維摩詰所說經) <i>Skt.</i> Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra	475
26-II	<i>Ch.</i> Yüeh-shang-nü-ching (月上女經) <i>Skt.</i> Candrottārādārikāparipṛcchā	480
26-III	<i>Ch.</i> Tso-ch'an-san-mei-ching (坐禪三昧經)	614

Vol. No.	Title	T. No.
26-IV	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-mo-to-lo-ch'an-ching (達磨多羅禪經) <i>Skt.</i> Yogācārabhūmi-sūtra (?)	618
27	<i>Ch.</i> Yüeh-têng-san-mei-ching (月燈三昧經) <i>Skt.</i> Samādhirājacandrapradipa-sūtra	639
28	<i>Ch.</i> Ju-lêng-ch'ieh-ching (入楞伽經) <i>Skt.</i> Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra	671
29-I	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-fang-kuang-yüan-chio-hsiu-to-lo-liao-i-ching (大方廣圓覺修多羅了義經)	842
29-II	<i>Ch.</i> Su-hsi-ti-chieh-lo-ching (蘇悉地羯羅經) <i>Skt.</i> Susiddhikaramahātantrasādhanaopāyika-paṭala	893
29-III	<i>Ch.</i> Mo-têng-ch'ieh-ching (摩登伽經) <i>Skt.</i> Mātāṅgī-sūtra (?)	1300
30-I	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-p'i-lu-chê-na-chêng-fo-shên-pien-chia-ch'ih-ching (大毘盧遮那成佛神變加持經) <i>Skt.</i> Mahāvairocanaṅghisambodhivikurvitādhiṣṭhāna- vaipulyasūtrendrarāja-nāma-dharmaparyāya	848
30-II	<i>Ch.</i> Ching-kang-ting-i-ch'ieh-ju-lai-chên-shih-shê-ta-ch'eng-hsien-chêng-ta-chiao-wang-ching (金剛頂一切如來真實攝大乘現證大教王經) <i>Skt.</i> Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgrahamahāyānābhi- samayamahākālpārāja	865
31-35	<i>Ch.</i> Mo-ho-sêng-ch'i-lü (摩訶僧祇律) <i>Skt.</i> Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya (?)	1425
36-42	<i>Ch.</i> Ssü-fên-lü (四分律) <i>Skt.</i> Dharmaguptaka-vinaya (?)	1428
43, 44	<i>Ch.</i> Shan-chien-lü-p'i-p'o-sha (善見律毘婆沙) <i>Pāli</i> Samantapāsādikā	1462
45-I	<i>Ch.</i> Fan-wang-ching (梵網經) <i>Skt.</i> Brahmajāla-sūtra (?)	1484
45-II	<i>Ch.</i> Yu-p'o-sai-chieh-ching (優婆塞戒經) <i>Skt.</i> Upāsakaśīla-sūtra (?) <i>Eng.</i> The Sutra on Upāsaka Precepts	1488

Vol. No.	Title	T. No.
46-I	<i>Ch.</i> Miao-fa-lien-hua-ching-yu-po-t'i-shê (妙法蓮華經憂波提舍) <i>Skt.</i> Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-upadeśa	1519
46-II	<i>Ch.</i> Fo-ti-ching-lun (佛地經論) <i>Skt.</i> Buddhabhūmisūtra-śāstra (?)	1530
46-III	<i>Ch.</i> Shê-ta-ch'eng-lun (攝大乘論) <i>Skt.</i> Mahāyānasamgraha <i>Eng.</i> The Summary of the Great Vehicle	1593
47	<i>Ch.</i> Shih-chu-p'i-p'o-sha-lun (十住毘婆沙論) <i>Skt.</i> Daśabhūmika-vibhāṣā (?)	1521
48, 49	<i>Ch.</i> A-p'i-ta-mo-chü-shê-lun (阿毘達磨俱舍論) <i>Skt.</i> Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya	1558
50-59	<i>Ch.</i> Yü-ch'ieh-shih-ti-lun (瑜伽師地論) <i>Skt.</i> Yogācārabhūmi	1579
60-I	<i>Ch.</i> Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun (成唯識論) <i>Eng.</i> Demonstration of Consciousness Only (In Three Texts on Consciousness Only)	1585
60-II	<i>Ch.</i> Wei-shih-san-shih-lun-sung (唯識三十論頌) <i>Skt.</i> Triṃśikā <i>Eng.</i> The Thirty Verses on Consciousness (In Three Texts on Consciousness Only)	1586
60-III	<i>Ch.</i> Wei-shih-êrh-shih-lun (唯識二十論) <i>Skt.</i> Viṃśatika <i>Eng.</i> The Treatise in Twenty Verses on Consciousness Only (In Three Texts on Consciousness Only)	1590
61-I	<i>Ch.</i> Chung-lun (中論) <i>Skt.</i> Madhyamaka-śāstra	1564
61-II	<i>Ch.</i> Pien-chung-pien-lun (辯中邊論) <i>Skt.</i> Madhyāntavibhāga	1600
61-III	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-ch'eng-ch'êng-yeh-lun (大乘成業論) <i>Skt.</i> Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa	1609
61-IV	<i>Ch.</i> Yin-ming-ju-chêng-li-lun (因明人正理論) <i>Skt.</i> Nyāyapraveśa	1630

Vol. No.	Title	T. No.
61-V	<i>Ch.</i> Chin-kang-chên-lun (金剛針論) <i>Skt.</i> Vajrasūci	1642
61-VI	<i>Ch.</i> Chang-so-chih-lun (彰所知論)	1645
62	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-ch'eng-chuang-yen-ching-lun (大乘莊嚴經論) 1604 <i>Skt.</i> Mahāyānasūtrālamkāra	
63-I	<i>Ch.</i> Chiu-ching-i-ch'eng-pao-hsing-lun (究竟一乘寶性論) <i>Skt.</i> Ratnagotravibhāgamahāyānottaratantra-śāstra	1611
63-II	<i>Ch.</i> P'u-t'i-hsing-ching (菩提行經) <i>Skt.</i> Bodhicaryāvatāra	1662
63-III	<i>Ch.</i> Chin-kang-ting-yü-ch'ieh-chung-fa-a-nou-to- lo-san-miao-san-p'u-t'i-hsin-lun (金剛頂瑜伽中發阿耨多羅三藐三菩提心論)	1665
63-IV	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-ch'eng-ch'i-hsin-lun (大乘起信論) <i>Skt.</i> Mahāyānaśraddhotpāda-śāstra (?)	1666
63-V	<i>Ch.</i> Na-hsien-pi-ch'iu-ching (那先比丘經) <i>Pāli</i> Milindapañhā	1670
64	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-ch'eng-chi-p'u-sa-hsüeh-lun (大乘集菩薩學論) 1636 <i>Skt.</i> Śikṣāsamuccaya	
65	<i>Ch.</i> Shih-mo-ho-yen-lun (釋摩訶衍論)	1688
66-I	<i>Ch.</i> Pan-jo-po-lo-mi-to-hsin-ching-yu-tsan (般若波羅蜜多心經幽贊)	1710
66-II	<i>Ch.</i> Kuan-wu-liang-shou-fo-ching-shu (觀無量壽佛經疏)	1753
66-III	<i>Ch.</i> San-lun-hsüan-i (三論玄義)	1852
66-IV	<i>Ch.</i> Chao-lun (肇論)	1858
67, 68	<i>Ch.</i> Miao-fa-lien-hua-ching-hsüan-i (妙法蓮華經玄義)	1716
69	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-ch'eng-hsüan-lun (大乘玄論)	1853

Vol. No.	Title	T. No.
70-I	<i>Ch.</i> Hua-yen-i-ch'eng-chiao-i-fên-ch'i-chang (華嚴一乘教義分齊章)	1866
70-II	<i>Ch.</i> Yüan-jên-lun (原人論)	1886
70-III	<i>Ch.</i> Hsiu-hsi-chih-kuan-tso-ch'an-fa-yao (修習止觀坐禪法要)	1915
70-IV	<i>Ch.</i> T'ien-t'ai-ssü-chiao-i (天台四教儀)	1931
71, 72	<i>Ch.</i> Mo-ho-chih-kuan (摩訶止觀)	1911
73-I	<i>Ch.</i> Kuo-ch'ing-pai-lu (國清百錄)	1934
73-II	<i>Ch.</i> Liu-tsu-ta-shih-fa-pao-t'an-ching (六祖大師法寶壇經)	2008
73-III	<i>Ch.</i> Huang-po-shan-tuan-chi-ch'an-shih-ch'uan- hsin-fa-yao (黃檗山斷際禪師傳心法要)	2012A
73-IV	<i>Ch.</i> Yung-chia-chêng-tao-ko (永嘉證道歌)	2014
74-I	<i>Ch.</i> Chên-chou-lin-chi-hui-chao-ch'an-shih-wu-lu (鎮州臨濟慧照禪師語錄) <i>Eng.</i> The Recorded Sayings of Linji (In Three Chan Classics)	1985
74-II	<i>Ch.</i> Wu-mên-kuan (無門關) <i>Eng.</i> Wumen's Gate (In Three Chan Classics)	2005
74-III	<i>Ch.</i> Hsin-hsin-ming (信心銘) <i>Eng.</i> The Faith-Mind Maxim (In Three Chan Classics)	2010
74-IV	<i>Ch.</i> Ch'ih-hsiu-pai-chang-ch'ing-kuei (勅修百丈清規)	2025
75	<i>Ch.</i> Fo-kuo-yüan-wu-ch'an-shih-pi-yen-lu (佛果圓悟禪師碧巖錄) <i>Eng.</i> The Blue Cliff Record	2003
76-I	<i>Ch.</i> I-pu-tsung-lun-lun (異部宗輪論) <i>Skt.</i> Samayabhedoparacanacakra	2031
76-II	<i>Ch.</i> A-yü-wang-ching (阿育王經) <i>Skt.</i> Aśoka-rāja-sūtra (?) <i>Eng.</i> The Biographical Scripture of King Aśoka	2043

Vol. No.	Title	T. No.
76-III	<i>Ch.</i> Ma-ming-p'u-sa-ch'uan (馬鳴菩薩傳)	2046
76-IV	<i>Ch.</i> Lung-shu-p'u-sa-ch'uan (龍樹菩薩傳)	2047
76-V	<i>Ch.</i> P'o-sou-p'an-tou-fa-shih-ch'uan (婆藪槃豆法師傳)	2049
76-VI	<i>Ch.</i> Pi-ch'iu-ni-ch'uan (比丘尼傳)	2063
76-VII	<i>Ch.</i> Kao-sêng-fa-hsien-ch'uan (高僧法顯傳)	2085
76-VIII	<i>Ch.</i> Yu-fang-chi-ch'ao: T'ang-ta-ho-shang-tung- chêng-ch'uan (遊方記抄: 唐大和上東征傳) <i>Eng.</i> The Great Tang Dynasty Record of the Western Regions	2089-(7)
77	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-t'ang-ta-tz'ü-ên-ssü-san-ts'ang-fa-shih- ch'uan (大唐大慈恩寺三藏法師傳) <i>Eng.</i> A Biography of the Tripiṭaka Master of the Great Ci'en Monastery of the Great Tang Dynasty	2053
78	<i>Ch.</i> Kao-sêng-ch'uan (高僧傳)	2059
79	<i>Ch.</i> Ta-t'ang-hsi-yü-chi (大唐西域記)	2087
80	<i>Ch.</i> Hung-ming-chi (弘明集)	2102
81-92	<i>Ch.</i> Fa-yüan-chu-lin (法苑珠林)	2122
93-I	<i>Ch.</i> Nan-hai-chi-kuei-nei-fa-ch'uan (南海寄歸內法傳)	2125
93-II	<i>Ch.</i> Fan-yü-tsa-ming (梵語雜名)	2135
94-I	<i>Jp.</i> Shō-man-gyō-gi-sho (勝鬘經義疏)	2185
94-II	<i>Jp.</i> Yui-ma-kyō-gi-sho (維摩經義疏)	2186
95	<i>Jp.</i> Hok-ke-gi-sho (法華義疏)	2187
96-I	<i>Jp.</i> Han-nya-shin-gyō-hi-ken (般若心經秘鍵)	2203
96-II	<i>Jp.</i> Dai-jō-hos-sō-ken-jin-shō (大乘法相研神章)	2309
96-III	<i>Jp.</i> Kan-jin-kaku-mu-shō (觀心覺夢鈔)	2312

Vol. No.	Title	T. No.
97-I	<i>Jp.</i> Ris-shū-kō-yō (律宗綱要) <i>Eng.</i> The Essentials of the Vinaya Tradition	2345
97-II	<i>Jp.</i> Ten-dai-hok-ke-shū-gi-shū (天台法華宗義集) <i>Eng.</i> The Collected Teachings of the Tendai Lotus School	2366
97-III	<i>Jp.</i> Ken-kai-ron (顯戒論)	2376
97-IV	<i>Jp.</i> San-ge-gaku-shō-shiki (山家學生式)	2377
98-I	<i>Jp.</i> Hi-zō-hō-yaku (秘藏寶鑰)	2426
98-II	<i>Jp.</i> Ben-ken-mitsu-ni-kyō-ron (辨顯密二教論)	2427
98-III	<i>Jp.</i> Soku-shin-jō-butsu-gi (即身成佛義)	2428
98-IV	<i>Jp.</i> Shō-ji-jis-sō-gi (聲字實相義)	2429
98-V	<i>Jp.</i> Un-ji-gi (吽字義)	2430
98-VI	<i>Jp.</i> Go-rin-ku-ji-myō-hi-mitsu-shaku (五輪九字明秘密釋)	2514
98-VII	<i>Jp.</i> Mitsu-gon-in-hotsu-ro-san-ge-mon (密嚴院發露懺悔文)	2527
98-VIII	<i>Jp.</i> Kō-zen-go-koku-ron (興禪護國論)	2543
98-IX	<i>Jp.</i> Fu-kan-za-zen-gi (普勸坐禪儀)	2580
99-103	<i>Jp.</i> Shō-bō-gen-zō (正法眼藏)	2582
104-I	<i>Jp.</i> Za-zen-yō-jin-ki (坐禪用心記)	2586
104-II	<i>Jp.</i> Sen-chaku-hon-gan-nen-butsu-shū (選擇本願念佛集) <i>Eng.</i> Senchaku Hongan Nembutsu Shū	2608
104-III	<i>Jp.</i> Ris-shō-an-koku-ron (立正安國論)	2688
104-IV	<i>Jp.</i> Kai-moku-shō (開目抄)	2689
104-V	<i>Jp.</i> Kan-jin-hon-zon-shō (觀心本尊抄)	2692
104-VI	<i>Ch.</i> Fu-mu-ên-chung-ching (父母恩重經)	2887

Vol. No.	Title	T. No.
105-I	<i>Jp.</i> Ken-jō-do-shin-jitsu-kyō-gyō-shō-mon-rui (顯淨土眞實教行証文類)	2646
105-II	<i>Jp.</i> Tan-ni-shō (歎異抄) <i>Eng.</i> Tannishō: Passages Deploing Deviations of Faith	2661
106-I	<i>Jp.</i> Ren-nyo-shō-nin-o-fumi (蓮如上人御文) <i>Eng.</i> Rennyo Shōnin Ofumi: The Letters of Rennyo	2668
106-II	<i>Jp.</i> Ō-jō-yō-shū (往生要集)	2682
107-I	<i>Jp.</i> Has-shū-kō-yō (八宗綱要) <i>Eng.</i> The Essentials of the Eight Traditions	蔵外
107-II	<i>Jp.</i> San-gō-shi-ki (三教指歸)	蔵外
107-III	<i>Jp.</i> Map-pō-tō-myō-ki (末法燈明記) <i>Eng.</i> The Candle of the Latter Dharma	蔵外
107-IV	<i>Jp.</i> Jū-shichi-jō-ken-pō (十七條憲法)	蔵外